# Recalcitrance of Oneself

**F.L. Coronado**

# CONTENTS

Preface ..... i

Acknowledgements ..... iii

METAPHYSICAL DISCOURSES

I: In defense of God's presence, and why life would fail without it

Origins of unexplainable, or undefined truthful concepts ..... 1

How miracles don't essentially function, and simply do not prove the existence of God's divinity ..... 12

Unachievable nature of Transcendental progress, with unideal phenomenon ..... 16

How God is being a primary constituent for Transcendental progress. ..... 26

SKEPTICAL DISCOURSES

II: Doubtful remarks against my own celestial argumentations, and problems of human mind with reason

Incongruences of my undeveloped conceptions pertaining to celestial possibilities ..... 32

Questions for Conscious Certainty ..... 35

Question 1: Whether atheism is the solution for mental superiority ..... 35

Question 2: Whether seeking God is impractical ..... 38

Question 3: Whether Transcendental progress functions in a Godless world ..... 39

Question 4: Why I initially constructed an oppositional discourse ..... 40

Question 5: How the Bible is an unreliable literature ..... 41

Creating the Concept of Gods ..... 44

EXISTENTIAL DISCOURSES

III: Necessity of seeking purposes for one's existence in a relentless world

What the ideal nature of living can be ..... 49

Philosophical living ..... 54
Continuity of Suicide ..... 63

ETHICAL DISCOURSES

IV: Unrealism, and disillusionment through understanding of ethics, and my propositions for moral transcendence (Prelude)

Raskolnikov's Faith ..... 69
Objectivity Over Morality ..... 72
God Never Created Evil... We Did! ..... 83
Positivism for the Exemplary ..... 86

AESTHETICAL DISCOURSES

V: Essence of Beauty, and Subjectivity in surrounding complexities (Prelude)

Validation as Vindication ..... 93
Superfluity of Poetry as a form of Artistic Expression ..... 97
Difficulty of Essays ..... 101

Author's Concluding Note ..... 103
References & Sources ..... 104

# Preface

Stupidity of a pointless being is a proof of our exemplary representation, yet demonstrates another form of definition for another side to be employed for yet another reason, just as the lack of darkness beheld by the essence of light, showing sadness within grief, and furthermore subjects to perceive, and experience, thus being judged in an empirical sense after said perception. I am tasked by myself to nag for the development of a fundamental, yet intensively small work regarding this human conflict.

This work is comprising of which will be divided into 5 sections namely celestial metaphysics, skepticism, existentialism, ethics, and aesthetics, with the first, and second entry wrote as counterpart of each other, shaping the overall thought of the reader into developing a critical viewpoint of everything several times after thorough comprehension. The cognitive dissonance encapsulated in portions of this work aims to surpass human reason for mere clarity, and accuracy of one's false ideals, or inconclusive beliefs. Though my intent is never centered for any confusion, rather the critical offense for the lack of function of one's practical reasoning for human perception into their own understanding of complexity of nature. One's own defiance is not in a mere refusal to conform but in the deeper resistance to the fundamentals that define their perception, cognition, and personal existence, a resistance symptomatic of the dissonance between finite human faculties, and the boundless complexity of nature provided by reality. This contradiction, far from being a perceived obstacle, serves as both a challenge, and an opportunity for absolute philosophical inquiry by the reader who properly perceived this work, revealing various limitations of human reason, and the potential for deeper understanding of natural probability for every unexplainable circumstance. Throughout such offers the seeming folly of purposelessness instead becomes a profound manifestation to the multiplicity of human experience, where even what appears meaningless serves as a lens for discerning alternative dimensions of subjective meaning, exemplifying all the paradoxical nature of every existence of which contradictions are embarked as integral to comprehension within human capabilities.

These subjective perception, and reasonable judgment encloses the dualities inherent in human experience, for empirical discourse, dualities that are neither oppositional nor hierarchical but rather simply complementary. Light therefore does not negate darkness; it defines the significance of its essence. Sadness does not represent only grief in itself; it deepens more functions it serves. These interrelations reveal the blindness of empirical judgments by collectivity, which barely seeks to categorize, and quantify phenomena without accounting for any interdependent nature. To perceive is not merely to observe but to engage with the essence of what is observed, gaining great amounts of knowledge, and insights, an engagement that transcends empirical analyses, which delves into the realm of metaphysical reflection for nature. Incoherence is aimed to be comprehended soulfully, as it reveals an anticipated truth for consideration.

This work, although quite flawed, is duly presented here with the goal to dismantle the illusions of subjective clarity, and certainty that often accompany human reasoning, and its inconsistencies with regards to cognition. This exploration seeks not to provide

absolute answers but to provoke more absurd questions predetermined to be questioned. Through this attempt of dialectical structure that challenges the author, and the reader to reconsider all their assumptions multiple times over for mere assurance, it concludes no further claims, nor final statements. As of awareness, Metaphysics confronts the foundational principles of one's own existence (of which in this case, the nature of God(s)); skepticism interrogates the absolute validity of those principles, and gathering claims for rebuttals; existentialism examines their complex implications for human experience, and the sole purposes of each factors, in a highlight contributing to the essence of human life, and its unresolved meaning, ethics initially evaluates impact on moral reasoning whilst critiquing, and actual importance for human ethical accordance; with the concluding statement regarding aesthetics which reflects on their expression through art, and beauty as a staple for human appreciation of living, providing mere construct for existential crises. Altogether considered as a whole dogma of unideal philosophy astray from complexity.

The dialectical approach encapsulated within this work is as purely as intentional for inconclusiveness, and fostered interpretation, designed not to confuse but to compel critical engagement. This offense is not aimed at individuals but at systems of thought that prioritize functionality over depth, efficiency over authenticity. By retorting these inadequacies, this work provokes the reader to confront their own limitations and reconsider their approach to understanding fundamental knowledge. As previously stated, this exploration is not about arriving at definitive conclusions but about embracing the natural uncertainty which defines human existence in itself. It is a confrontation to think critically, question deeply, and perceive expansively—a call to resist deviance not by rejecting, yet by understanding its role in shaping thought, and experience. Through this process, readers may find themselves drawn into a deeper engagement with the complexities of reality, an engagement that challenges them to transcend their limitations and expand their capacity for perception and reasoning. For being explicit regarding the main purpose of this work consists partial instruments from rhetorical argumentation for the sake of critical approach of individuals who perceive this work, and either disprove, or prove its effectivity, or perfection through several stages of mind-boggling questions, into perplexing personal discourse, or a shared view of two. All logic behind such work doesn't insist on its reliability into analytics for it serves an unconventional method of cognition, instead of following all conceptual norms developed by collective discourses which were gathered out of pure hypotheses, from conditional thoughts. To simply engage with this framework is not merely an intellectual exercise rather being a transformative experience, one that reshapes perception and redefines understanding of one's own, in defiance for their own favour.

—Coronado, F.L.

# Acknowledgements

This work wouldn't even exist, and my life wouldn't as well if my mental hardships didn't revolve around, commanding my own behaviours, and method of thinking into something explicitly interesting such as this whole plentiful. It is my main duty to acknowledge my serious mental instability, of which I preserve to throw my best regards, and thanks to, for it to develop my whole self into something, nay—someone who was capable of becoming an unanticipated being with a school of thought indifferent from other normal thinking minds.

Such disorder is something to be manipulated, and taken advantage of by persons who could benefit from it for the longest, being my own self, in competition to my family. It made a remarkably significant effect on my way of doing things since my enlightenment period up to this day of writing this work, and more works in mind of which my severe procrastination, anhedonia, and my own disorder discourages me to continue for good. Though this problem never gave me abnormal intelligence unlike those popular figures who bear such curses, I still prefer the state of my mind now. As much gratitude is a sense of own identity to recognize success. These unbearable productions of my mind became supplementary to my own thinking even in the most mundane circumstances of life, and living it.

Most wouldn't have been thankful for all personal traumas they had experienced whether as a child, an infant, or an adult, yet I beg to differ (even if this section already makes the reader think how shallow my traumas would've been for it to be able to get managed mentally by a child itself.) It is a shame of all my life how these traumas came into me, and started to create detrimental causes for chaos of mind, yet it was an achievement to overcome those matters, regardless of the severity of each one. I am not as thankful to my traumas as to my mental illnesses, though I mustn't conclude this section without giving recognition to it, just as much as it deserves for my whole life. There seemed to be no any particular justification in defense of mental instability as a form of foundational support to one's personal achievable heeding, and articulation in manipulating constant incongruences into something remarkable as a flawed argumentative form of whining towards controversial endeavors, full of the incongruences led to believe to be defined by sanitizing it into something as acceptable as a common human mistake, erecting the sense of personal truth that "I prevail to become someone as I have just expected myself to be, not in a negative side of aspects, but of what I dream to become as, enthusiastically as a child", I am completely barged by my conflicting ideas which alienate this particular sense of being hopeful, or being in the longest despair I have ever been in terms of solidifying a proper manuscript.

The last factor of my acknowledgement, are materialistically practical as those were literature, magnificent literature of which opened more doors in my mind to circulate my questions to humanity, and nature, while also being educated to the whims of those, book after book. From authors, and books that gave me an accurate depiction of certain overcoming, to treatises that question my own certainty towards my set of beliefs (which made me more skeptical) became an advantageous script of occurrences to force me into the hardest slap of reality this world has to offer. All for which contained a

phenomenal conflicting feat of suffering, and I indulged in uncertainty, as deep as how this mental endeavor goes.

# METAPHYSICAL DISCOURSES

# I

# In defense of God's presence, and why life would fail without it

# Origins of unexplainable, or undefined truthful concepts

Modern, and classical revolution of intellect among human discourse is how God does, or doesn't exist, though in overall circumstance, will this actually improve anything into transcendence, but rather just reach the chaos it preserves supposedly after the process of concluding transcendence? Will this seek the embodiment of objective idealistic phenomenon for all living, and non-living things? Employing the possibility of God's omnipotence, this is certainly functional, but even such presence may exist, the employment of such power is denied, and/or we're still too feeble enough to discover for countless millennium after living in a subjective conflict within theistic, and atheistic viewpoints. As God may have thought of such, we're declined for a showcase of miraculous interplays for the sake of simply just proving it. Arguing for the existence of God is a lifelong core conflict of these intellectuals, yet gathering all their thoughts creates a piece of discourse full of questions, which seeks answers for absolute nothingness. It entertains the essence of arguing, but not the significance of mere improvement. It lacks passion for the betterment of humanity, by revolving on a different, and mistaken passion misinterpreted as the former. Insofar, I've come to explain briefly: the misinterpretation seeks full understanding of the truths, without an objective single truth, but a whole structured, while a crowd of anticipation for an ideal physical, and psychological response for humanity's change towards goodness due to the impact of the discovered truth after years. Yet how does truth actually impact the life of being? For the purpose of research, and intellectual discovery for referential purposes, it largely does. Though in more complex factors such as economic, environmental, financial, and the maintenance of well-being, it doesn't seem to have any effect. For instance, it was a great contribution to humanity how Newton discovered the "Laws of Motion", by understanding how things function, and move, in a natural, and violent state. Taking this discovery into making improvement for the poverty, and corrupted minds in this world, does this take effect? I certainly don't think so. If the reader's own defense to that argument is the lack of correlation between the two unrelated subjects, it simply proves the unreliability of the purpose of truth, being singlehandedly useless for the rest, while functional for a specific subject. Whilst transcendental progress must take every field of subject collected in a plethora of progressive improvement. It does sound sort of an omnipotent phenomenon, as it truly is.

The question of God’s existence has remained a defining concern within metaphysical discourse, approached from various angles across theological, philosophical, and empirical traditions. Yet beyond the binary of affirmation or denial lies a more pressing inquiry: whether such discourse yields any practical or existential outcome beyond abstract contemplation. The continual engagement with divine existence, while intellectually rich, often results in an insular circuit of speculation, reflection, and counterargument. In many cases, these discussions neither resolve fundamental metaphysical tensions nor produce measurable advancements in ethical, societal, or epistemic domains. It becomes necessary, therefore, to ask whether the pursuit of such a truth is transformative or whether it sustains itself purely through the mechanics of inquiry, detached from consequence.

If the divine is conceived as omnipotent, omniscient, and omnipresent, then its existence implies a structuring principle behind all reality, one capable of establishing causality, order, and ultimate purpose. However, the lack of perceivable intervention or empirical manifestation renders such a being functionally inaccessible. When a postulated entity exerts no discernible influence upon the natural order, its presence becomes indistinguishable from absence. In this light, the divine assumes the role of a metaphysical placeholder, invoked to explain that which remains unexplained, yet resistant to integration within the empirical framework of knowledge. Arguments persist in favor of this presence, often sophisticated in form, but they rarely converge upon a shared epistemic foundation or generate actionable insight that would justify their centrality to human progress.

This reveals a deeper issue within metaphysical investigation: the tendency to equate conceptual complexity with existential relevance. Truth, if it is to serve as a catalyst for transcendence or improvement, must demonstrate applicability beyond its own domain. A discovery that remains confined to speculative abstraction, regardless of its internal coherence, holds limited value in a world that demands cross-disciplinary synthesis and pragmatic orientation. Even the most profound scientific revelations which of those being Newton, Darwin, or Einstein whom all have not eradicated ethical failures, social fragmentation, or existential despair. Their truths altered perception, but did not guarantee betterment. In this respect, the divine, as a metaphysical postulate, may offer explanatory scope, yet without demonstrable integration into the lived structures of reality, it remains suspended between intellectual fascination and ontological irrelevance.

With absurd ceaseless pursuit of this very transcendence, we encounter the cyclical dilemma of existential validation of all matter constituent totaling this reality: whether empirical knowledge, in its vast, and abstract summation, serves further significant purpose beyond its own entanglement with human intellect too flawed to figure out inclusive pertained knowledge. The core of the incongruence, rather, is not whether objective truth exists, but whether its own discovery employs the very transformation that philosophical, and theological debates have promised since the inception of self-awareness within humanity. God, in this sense, becomes a sacred emblem not of an entity dictating the laws of every matter of existence, but of a perpetual paradox by divination, that one that simultaneously enables the boundless potential of human cognition, and intellectual interpretation, while restricting its direct applicability to the material conditions of being in itself for significance. This intellectual conflict, deeply embedded in theistic and atheistic discourse, acts as a corner-less maze that self-perpetuates through relentless counterarguments, never converging on a tangible pathway that leads toward the progressive unification of all fundamental realities, of which intangible capabilities are yet to be unachieved. For if we assume the existence of mere omnipotence factoring responses of infinite circumstances, yet recognize that such power is inaccessible to our plane of consciousness for the reason of our inferiority, then the nature of divine intent is rendered inconsequential, or at least functionally indifferent, to the direct advancement of the living condition of humanity as it is achieved. The reasoning that follows, then, is not an inquiry into divinity’s every

purpose, being only an observation of how the obsession with proving, or disproving its validity effectively nullifies its significance in pragmatic spheres.

The persistent effort to establish transcendence through epistemological or theological means frequently fails to produce a cohesive framework applicable to the concrete conditions of human life. While the recognition of human cognitive limitations is a necessary premise in metaphysical discourse, it must also be acknowledged that the pursuit of knowledge, in its current form, often privileges internal consistency over external applicability. The extensive articulation of metaphysical systems, while intellectually rigorous, has not yielded a unified ontological model that meaningfully integrates the divine into the empirical, the speculative into the actionable, or the transcendent into the immediate. Consequently, the repeated formulation of arguments concerning divine omnipotence, epistemic uncertainty, and existential insufficiency may be seen as self-reinforcing, rather than as progressive engagements with the real. This recursive methodology produces an epistemological impasse. The assumption that an ultimate truth, once revealed, would inherently result in moral or existential improvement is not borne out by historical or contemporary observation. Philosophical and theological traditions have, for centuries, articulated increasingly complex arguments regarding the existence, nature, and necessity of a divine principle, yet these formulations rarely translate into structural improvements in human society. The divine, when positioned as an explanatory absolute, becomes impervious to empirical verification and, more importantly, irrelevant to systems of material advancement, ethical governance, or existential clarity. Its conceptual grandeur, though intellectually provocative, is rendered ineffective if it cannot operate within the ontological boundaries accessible to human faculties. The argument that divine truth possesses transformative power presumes a causal relationship between metaphysical certainty and pragmatic evolution. However, the absence of such a relationship, either in historical precedent or in theoretical formulation, suggests that divine truth—if it exists does not function as a catalyst for immediate human betterment. Rather, it exists as an abstract construct that informs interpretation but does not direct outcomes. This implies a critical distinction: the divine may serve a symbolic or epistemological function, yet it fails to meet the criteria of instrumental efficacy. Therefore, belief in the divine cannot be justified on the basis of utility, and disbelief cannot be dismissed as morally or intellectually deficient. The value of such belief must be assessed on ontological grounds alone, independent of its consequences.

Insofar, the notion that omnipotence exists beyond human access introduces a structural asymmetry into the discourse, one that invalidates any argument relying on mutual intelligibility. If the divine is categorically inaccessible, then it cannot be the subject of rational inquiry, nor can it serve as a basis for universal metaphysical claims. The limitation of human faculties, while real, does not warrant the projection of hypothetical absolutes that cannot be demonstrated or employed. This approach ultimately undermines the coherence of metaphysical thought by allowing non-falsifiable entities to dominate discourse without offering reciprocal epistemic accountability. In such a structure, God becomes not an object of inquiry, but a placeholder for explanatory deficiency.

In all sum, the invocation of the divine within metaphysical discourse, while historically significant, must be reevaluated in light of its limited capacity to inform or transform the conditions of human existence. A sustained critique must therefore separate the symbolic, epistemological, and functional dimensions of the divine and resist conflating ontological speculation with practical efficacy. Only by adhering to such distinctions can metaphysical discourse retain both its intellectual integrity and its relevance to broader philosophical and existential concerns.

We have substituted the endeavor for meaningful, yet imperfect transcendence with an intellectual labyrinth, in which scholars, theologians, and skeptics alike are ensnared within endless repetitions of the same inquiry over, and over for eternity, repackaged in various linguistically ideological structures. And yet, despite these exhaustive debates over nothing, the external world remains unjustly unaffected; mass hunger is never lessened by metaphysical certainty of this celestial collective discourses, nor does suffering subside beneath the weight of epistemological exactitude.

This trajectory toward transcendence is fractured, not only in its prioritization of redundant dialogues over scientific, and philosophical actions, but also in its failure to acknowledge the inherent divergence between abstract truth, and practical existence inconsistent with certainty. When truth is sought in a deeper solace of isolation, detached from the complex machinery that governs the human experience, and empirical senses, it loses its integrative power to transcendence. Theological, and philosophical pursuits have, for centuries, functioned under the assumption that truth, once unveiled, carries an important force capable of altering human nature itself for eternal outcomes in a generative species. Yet history has revealed time, and again that knowledge, irrespective of its profundity, doesn't fairly transform the moral fabric of human civilization. As humans learn from mistakes to commit into another one. Consider the monumental revelations of the scientific revolution as for Newton’s articulation of his laws of motion, Einstein’s unraveling of general theory of relativity, with Darwin dissecting biological evolution of species, each of these scientifically substantial discoveries converges an unprecedented expansion of natural understanding, yet none have, in themselves, resolved the enduring crises of ethical corruption, socio-economic disparity, or existential suffering of the oppressed. The reliance on niches of truth as an independent agent of consequential change is, therefore, a miscalculation of its function, as it embodies inferiority, seeking no farther than features of omni-capabilities. Rather than being a force of significant transformation, subjective truth is a mere instrument requiring deliberately structured application across all domains of human existence to manifest as progress of something ill. The desperate failure to recognize this distinction has resulted in an epistemological division of inter-subjectivity, in which intellectual discoveries amass in an ever-growing repository of knowledge while remaining fundamentally disconnected from the mechanisms that govern the lived experience of human beings, serving one purpose for one phase, disregarded for other fields. The illusion of progress in such discourse masks the absence of actual progress in even subjected reality (stating no further realism is reliable for belief), and thus, transcendence remains an unattainable complex abstraction rather than a constructed phenomenon grounded in multifunctional evolution of mere discoveries.

Insofar, for such schema of intellectual pursuit, the misalignment of inquiry, and application has effectively confined transcendence to an unreachable realm, rendering it an object of contemplation rather than a tangible destination. The tendency to isolate truth within specialized disciplines such as philosophy, science, theology that creates an ecosystem in which each field refines its internal structures yet fails to bridge itself toward a cohesive vision of human elevation. The argument for the existence of God, as a singular example, has been so thoroughly dissected and scrutinized that it has evolved into an intellectual spectacle rather than a functional endeavor; it is an argument that sustains itself through infinite refutations and reformulations without producing a decisive outcome that alters the trajectory of the human condition. The misinterpretation of intellectual pursuit as an inherently progressive force is at the root of this stagnation as for scholars, and thinkers have mistaken the perpetual refinement of ideas for advancement itself, when in truth, progress demands an integrative methodology that applies every dimension of understanding toward a unified framework of betterment. If transcendence is to be more than a conceptual aspiration, it must emerge not from the mere accumulation of knowledge, but from its structured and deliberate implementation across every dimension of existence. A paradigm shift must occur to one in which truth is no longer pursued for its own sake, but is wielded as an omnipotent force of transformation, bridging the intellectual, material, ethical, and existential realms into a singular, ascending phenomenon. Without such an integration, transcendence will remain a phantom ideal, eternally sought but never attained, entrapped within the labyrinth of discourse that, while illuminating, ultimately leads nowhere beyond itself.

The world may never attain this specific form of progress, as humanity is fundamentally flawed in every conceivable aspect, both tangible and intangible, from the empirical to the conceptual, with these flaws deeply embedded within the structural and existential frameworks defining our existence, rendering us incapable of transcending the boundaries imposed by our finite nature despite the most advanced intellectual and technological endeavors, which remain constrained by the inherent imperfections of the human condition. Celestial features as such as phenomena transcending the ordinary and defying natural laws of which are relegated to the realm of humanistic myth, existing beyond empirical verification and rational explanation, occupying a liminal space between the known and the unknown, the possible and the impossible, the natural and the supernatural, with miracles exemplifying this transition as events exceeding the capacity of possibility as understood within natural laws, rupturing the fabric of reality and suspending the ordinary to manifest the extraordinary, ascribed not to human agency but to a force or entity beyond human comprehension, giving rise to the concept of a celestial being, often referred to as God, embodying the impossible and transcending mortal limitations, serving as the ultimate bearer of impossible circumstances, capabilities, motions, and actions, whether splendid or abhorrent, invariably categorized as miraculous, defying the constraints of possibility within the human framework, and testifying to a reality beyond human understanding. The notion of a miracle challenges not only theology but also philosophy and epistemology, forcing confrontation with the limitations of knowledge and the boundaries of comprehension, highlighting the inadequacy of human systems of thought and inquiry, reminding us of phenomena that cannot be explained, predicted, or controlled regardless of intellectual or technological advancement, raising profound

questions about the nature of progress and the limits of human potential, suggesting realms of reality forever beyond our grasp, no matter how far we advance in understanding the natural world. The concept of a celestial being symbolizes transcendence while reminding us of our limitations, embodying forces and realities beyond human experience and understanding, underscoring the fragility and impermanence of human existence, acknowledging the mysteries at the heart of existence, with the pursuit of understanding these mysteries reflecting the enduring human desire to transcend limitations and seek meaning in an inscrutable universe, yet reminding us that some questions may never be answered and phenomena may never be understood, encapsulating the tension between the desire for knowledge and the inevitability of ignorance, shaping our aspirations, failures, and understanding of the world.

Humanity, for all its intellectual features into certainty, and technological advancements, remains shackled by the very mechanisms that enable its own growth creating a paradoxical contradiction, trapped in an infinite recursion of knowledge that expands outward but never reaches a point of ultimate clarity as objective truthfulness. The sole idea of transcendence stands not as an attainable state (if it is aimed for the authentic matter), of which plays as a concept fueling the never-ending march of infinite progression of humanity that of which is an unachievable asymptote that humans endlessly approaches without hope of arrival of what is to be expected primarily. This is not due to a failure of immense effort, nor the inadequacy of human reasoning alone (of which I evaluate as inferior, without the possibility for improvement itself, although it reached the culmination of such every consistent method), but rather the fundamental structure of every existence itself, where every revelation birth new complex obscurity branched out, and each answer unearths further uncertainties for every discovery made in time. The paradox of understanding: having more degree of knowing, concludes into the realization of the vastness of what remains unknown within this realm of knowledge, creating an illusion of practical advancement that, in truth, only extends the frontiers of our own limited resources, implying ignorance. Within this concept, the endless debate surrounding the divine, the certainty of miracles, and the metaphysical is not merely a theological quandary but mostly an existential, and epistemological one, for it deduces oppositional possibilities for its assurance within its existence, and realistic premises which conducts security for actual occurrences. Through the revelation of such, states every fracture in human perception making the ultimate comprehension impossible, deeming requirements of flawless bearers. We never fail to understand miracles for supernatural reasoning, and inconsistencies with the truth; we fail because understanding itself is an inherently incomplete tool, forged by beings who cannot transcend the parameters of their own cognition, fortifying mere inferiority, and limitations of capabilities. Extending across all-natural disciplines whether scientific, philosophical, or theological rendering every field of inquiry a circular endless discourse, constructing elaborate structures of thought of which despite their intricacy, remain self-contained and unable to break through into absolute assurance.

To entertain the concept of a celestial being, omnipotent and unrestricted by the material constraints that bind mortal existence, hence humanity, primarily is to contemplate a mode of being so fundamentally alien to human understanding,

perception, and physical attributions which in any attempt to define it within our conceptual fundamentality becomes a contradiction in itself. The divine, as it exists, is not bound by the limitations of issues such as causality, time, or rational necessity, and therefore will never be measured, refuted, or proven by any methodology accessible to human reasoning so far. Yet, the human mind recoils at such an assertion, for to accept it is to admit the futility of reasonable explanation, to acknowledge that there exists a certain phenomenon that will forever evade the grasp of intellect no matter how sophisticated our methods become to dissect these coexisting theories. This realization, however, is not a concession to ignorance but rather a clear affirmation of the limitations of structured knowledge instilled within humanity. It mainly suggests science, philosophy, and theology all provide meaningful contributions to human understanding in case of crises, as they ultimately operate within a closed system as such as one that can refine and expand its internal logic indefinitely for ages, but cannot escape the boundaries imposed by the very nature of cognition itself which lasts for eternity. The pursuit of crucial natural objective truth, therefore, will not be reaching an endpoint but about navigating the vast and shifting landscape of uncertainty, an endeavor that provides the illusion of progress while reinforcing the permanence of our limitations.

The implications of this extend beyond the realm of metaphysics and into the very foundation of human civilization, where the assumption that knowledge equates to advancement is deeply ingrained in societal structures. Yet history has demonstrated time, and again that while discoveries reshape our understanding of the universe, such as natural origins, or the cosmos, they do not necessarily lead to moral, existential, or spiritual progress along the way. The acquisition of knowledge does not necessarily eradicate suffering, nor does it eliminate the persistent flaws within human nature that perpetuate conflict, greed, and existential dissatisfaction. If the laws of motion, the principles of relativity, and the mechanisms of biological evolution have not eradicated recurrences of warfare, poverty, or ethical corruption, then what assurance is there to be offered that future advancements, no matter how profound… will do so? The harsh reality is that knowledge, when isolated from action, and ethical integration, remains a tool without a purpose beyond its own proliferation. It constructs intricate theoretical frameworks, expands technological capabilities, and enables feats of engineering, and practical computation, yet it does not address the fundamental crises of the loop of existence: the search for absolute meaning for living, the inevitability of suffering, and the limitations of human capacities. In this sense, transcendence must be redefined not as an endpoint of absolute knowledge, but as a holistic synthesis of intellectual, ethical, and existential evolution which acknowledges the perpetual inadequacy of human efforts while striving to cultivate meaning within that inadequacy. It is not the achievement of omniscience that defines progress, but rather the ability to navigate the impossibility of omniscience with wisdom, humility, and purpose. The search for understanding, then, is not an exercise in futility but an affirmation of the human condition as an eternal pursuit that, despite its impossibility, remains the driving force behind civilization’s most profound aspirations to transcend from time to time.

A single miracle abolishes a population of mindless immigrants for an essence of being shackled by the reward of obtaining one, by the method of worshiping, and praising the concept without mere comprehension of its significance, and how its nature

truly preserves the degree of impossibility within it by proving itself countless times for the blindness and ignorance of those who perceives. We're strictly doomed to incline into the circumstance of accordance to countless spiritual laws given by ancestors no different to our kind, with everything impossible also unattainable by them in their times. Thus, even constructing a complex nature of various concepts, mere transcendental progress is unachievable regardless of the degree of strength to an idea given to these concepts. Of which boldly generates the introduction, and conceptualization of a deity who bears all unachievable regards, and impossible tasks for flawed creatures including humans. It is greatly thought how Gods may exist, honestly. It contributes to the problem of questions without sought responses, an explanation of an unexplained will prevail as its solution to the question. It also withholds a large amount of impossibilities still yet to be discovered slowly, though gradually by humanity, whilst it remains stagnant as a significant concept followed by humanity until it ceases to exist. How powerful does a God appear to be? Quite unfathomable as everything present that is not discovered, and comprehended yet by beings it manifests its presence to.

The human experience is marked by an innate desire to transcend the limitations of existence, to reach beyond the confines of what is known, and understood, for the hopes of favourable conclusions of their own efforts. This aspiration is deeply intertwined with the concept of a divine being, embodying the essence of the unattainable. The progressive pursuit of understanding such a being isn't just an intellectual exercise, but a profound existential quest for being, and becoming. It is within this context that the notion of miracles, and divine intervention emerges, serving as a bridge between the mundane, and the transcendent. The power of a God, in this case, is not just a matter revolving omnipotence, but rather omnipresence manifesting in every aspect of existence, from the intricate design of the universe to the profound mysteries of human consciousness. This omnipresence is what renders the sacred concept of God both captivating, and hugely elusive, inspiring generations to seek answers to questions that may forever remain unanswerable for eternity. Yet, it is in this pursuit of the unknowable that humanity finds its greatest strength, for it is through the exploration of the divine that we are reminded of the infinite possibilities that lie beyond the horizon of our current understanding. As such, the idea of a God remains an enduring and powerful force, guiding humanity toward a deeper appreciation of the mysteries that surround us, and the infinite potential that lies within us. The human quest for understanding the divine is fundamentally tied to our existential condition. It reflects our innate desire to find meaning and purpose in a world that is often chaotic and unpredictable. The concept of a God serves as a focal point for this search, embodying both the transcendent and the mysterious. Philosophically, this pursuit raises profound questions about the nature of existence, morality, and the human condition. It challenges us to consider the limits of our knowledge and the extent of our understanding, highlighting the vast expanse of the unknown that lies before us. In this sense, the power of a God is not just a theological concept, but a philosophical and existential one, inspiring us to explore the depths of human potential and the mysteries of the universe. This exploration, while often fruitless in terms of definitive answers, enriches our understanding of ourselves and our place within the cosmos, fostering a deeper appreciation for the complexity and beauty of existence. Ultimately, the concept of God

remains a powerful catalyst for human inquiry and reflection, guiding us toward a more profound engagement with the world and our role within it.

Transcendental progress shall be categorized in which consideration in particular? In favour of Epicurean philosophy, rational pleasure is a factor of this progress, obtaining the highest good, and fulfilment of man, without regress into consequential outcomes, or large excess for chaos. Passion requires absolute purpose, and meaning for pursuit, not followed by irrationality, or lack of direction for randomized purposive advocacy. Of which this state transcendental progress requires a grand amount of meaning just as such, regardless of its significance of essential reason (excluding unpleasant purposes/results). Just as it concludes the thought of which, it shall be considered a transcendental progress, mere negative devastation, or meaning underscores the absence of categorization as transcendental progress. Ataraxia must always be present, and secured within the most priority, as well as Aponia. From absence of mental despair, and physical damage, surpassing human standards of improvement is a largely achievable start for transcendental progress. Wholly incorporating the gradual shift of constant action, reaction effect is also a factor of this, defying constancy within celestial harmony, without the typicality of its situation as celestials. Transcendental progress itself surpasses the features of omni-capability deities in control of every single molecule this existence has to represent in a variety of worlds. Thus, it also contradicts the control of such beings for its manifestation to present itself, which assumes an autonomous nature behind transcendental progress. This concept can be perceived in every way, as I completely state which I perceive it as such personally. Transcendental progress is absolutely conscious on its own, similar to humanity's capability to be rational, and choose to be otherwise out of autonomy. It is a justified case of a sharpened aspect of human capabilities into the highest form of its culmination. Thus, it is solely inhuman, deviant of human standards of attaining greatest good of all, transcendental progress is merely objective whereas humanity's perception is subjective, these perceived concepts clash upon a conclusion unfavorable for humanity's perspective, as it defies every comprehension it took to define what "good" truly is. Briefly, it does not satisfy the needs of humans for greater good, but it revolves on every aspect of existence for executing the greatest good.

Explaining this circumstance, if what benefits a typical human is to digest vast amount of natural production, such as plants, and animals, and water to survive, this favoured circumstance disfavors the welfare of all three, and more factors, underscoring bias towards beneficial only to humanity, not for everything. Which is already paradoxical to be thought out, as if we decline humans into digesting these may cause death to such, as they weren't provided what is necessary for their well-being, destroying also their welfare, yet favours all three factors stated, and more yet to be digested for lifelong living of humanity in a continuous cycle. In an unexplainable force, in my personal statement, this highlights the objective complexity of transcendental progress, with only just considering this thought yet, without delving deeper into more complexities it lacks to show for representation of interpretation. Or could this actually mean we're yet inferior enough to understand such complexities in our current manner of mental comprehensive state? It baffles my mind how greatly complicated this

concept absolutely is, yet fascinating to discover how indiscoverable existences are still longing for further identification of categorization into definition.

We could fairly take this circumstance in another case for another complication, within the nature of God's presence, and existence. Don't we seem to think how complex this being's nature truly is, for it to complicate itself into a continuous process of not sending clear representations of its existence to our world, but may already be perceived, conquered, and fully understood by other beings apart from us, as imperfect ones? I wouldn't desire to disclose this as "only perfect, or other celestial beings are worthy to achieve such, being impossible in cases of non-celestial ones", as I rather seek into a conclusion of entertaining the oppositional possibility as well, further since I have stated the absence of actual so-called "miracles", rejecting that something is impossible to begin with. Beginning with the perception of the absence of miracles, we're more inclined towards a thought of rationality, rather than being illogical throughout an argumentative mind about the metaphysical nature of God's existence. As we deeply entertain how imperceptible miracles truly are, depending on the era of its manifestation of representation, this causes an absolute conclusion for understanding God. Everything still argued about its existence by two parties are still imperceptible in their age, as they agree to argue contradictory arguments which lead to nothing as it does not progress to actually finding out the objective truth behind the argument.

As we're largely well aware of various circulating arguments for proof regarding God's existence, which do not favour a single doctrine for one entity, colliding all ideals, from viewpoints of these philosophers, and theologians, no sooner from now (even after centuries of such discourses) we're closer to the process of actual scrutiny for finding more knowledge about God. Though I must say humanity had done an excellent progress in seeking ample volume of validated conditional perceptions regarding God's features, yet with our limited resources, and knowledge, also with extensive varieties of interpretation, viewpoints clash, yet almost in unison about one thing: God is an epitome of superiority over ourselves. From ancient discourses about God glorifying nature in itself, it wasn't much highlighting the eras which humanity does not consider seeking interpretations for unknowable resources, and circumstances. Though I wouldn't desire to step into that hole incorporating ancient atheism. It doesn't seem to be too foolish how these generative concluding assumptions are, though it is highly unconventional, later becoming a staple of common human mental lifestyle. In modern discourse, most of these theories are deemed impossible, and ridiculous. Ridiculousness led into more intelligent progression for discoveries vastly proving more sensible, and rational conclusions. It may be highly considered how profound these theories were in their time due to lack of autonomous needs within humanity to question, and discover more oppositional viewpoints, although a few did, yet we're gradually toppled by various more extending/evolving theories in defense for this, which did require large amount of validations by beings of folly, or pawns to be more precise. From being unconventional, and against the ignorant norms, it truly shows how introspective discoveries largely impact the authoritative presumptions once given, even with lacking motivation for proof, and even the presence of proof itself naturally represented for concretion.

How do these concepts, and nature actually manifest, and present itself for deeper perception of humanity? In theory, I suggest this conception within the position of the unknown, and the known for eternity. As it came to be known within humanity, knowledge is a provable constancy of mind power revolving consciousness in empirical senses. Consciousness solely reacts depending on neurological interpretations of one's response of perception through experiential senses, concluding inaccurate representations of the world, as it is never objective for the means of providing absolute truth for perceivable circumstances. In this realm of subjectivity, they often rely for achieving objectivity by collective discourse, and agreed affairs of determined certainties. From perceived misconceptions, these circumstances aren't instantaneously executed by brilliance of such ideas, turned into mere inconvenient delusions ironically seeking comfort, and security of mind's comprehension. The fear of unknowingly aware of an initial experience of one's existence, whether conceptually, or physically disturbs the human psyche, entailing construction of intellect for gathering further assessments for complete representation of collective comprehension, this applies both in ancient, and modern discourses of human capabilities. For the hopes of this process, a well-versed result will be provided, and shared as a profound discovery, and creation by intellectual sectors of these sensory conceptions. Insofar, discloses the claims for God's recurrences of its omnipotence. As to how functionally flawed these findings conclude surpasses the fathomless perception of humanity's ignorance.

Insofar for every progress which occurs prevents another development in placement, as it manifests another series of occurrences through this generation, therefore inconclusiveness is inevitable for a natural process to follow a certain series, abandoning other possibilities of which are left existent, yet not intact for further validation of its actual essence, prohibiting a source for another manifestation in the mind of humanity to seek proper discourses in any particular fields, withholding the justification of every thought entertaining positional circulation of such will be flawed in logical aspects, as it doesn't concretely back up propositions of absurd claims, such as the existence of a celestial deity full of impossibilities within its essential features to generate the most ridiculous complexities of beings, without providing full access to all knowledge behind everything that is to be perceived, of which is an impossibility as obviously stated, justifying the significance of this deity in question.

The alteration of reality in a deliberately long process is highly questionable, yet also understandable in a sense of God implicating every explanation necessary to understand a conceptual process of natural causes.

# How miracles don't essentially function, and simply do not prove the existence of God's divinity

Justifying the cause of a miracle's occurrence is a matter of self-humiliation, and public humiliation if being argued for the mass' view. Correlation between miracles, and God isn't reliable to begin with for the consideration of correlation itself. Both concepts do not interconnect, nor simplify the bridge between the two, with essentiality of one for the other, vice versa. As previously stated, we never experienced miracles, but rather occurrences still undefined, unexplained, and undiscovered by the perception of humanity's capacity to comprehend yet. We see transcendental instances of progression by the occurrences of so-called "miracles", truly representing how undefined circumstances will be interpreted as, correlating to the autonomy of a celestial being due to its uniqueness, deviance of impossibility, and rare instances. Though, this isn't practically the case, as transcendent/celestial entities belong to a category of bearers of unidentifiable, and undefined phenomenon/circumstances until it becomes not. In the statement of miracles, this wouldn't happen as it solidifies the fact of being perceivable, and known in certain moments given by humankind's fate, similar to Gods, yet with slight differences of having the certainty of miraculous circumstances to be perceived, or empirically proven, whilst the case of Gods differs by being unknown for the rest of eternity, or until it shifts otherwise which don't serve any probability of certainty at all, though both manifestations are completely randomized for the consideration of favouring non-pattern situations of all events, in accordance to nature.

The attribution of miraculous events to divine intervention lacks epistemological justification. The claim that miracles occur as evidence of divine will cannot be substantiated without conflating unknown phenomena with metaphysical intent. The correlation between miracles and a deity remains speculative; there is no demonstrable causal relationship that necessitates the involvement of a supernatural agent in unexplained events. The definition of a miracle presupposes a suspension or violation of natural law, yet such events are more accurately described as anomalies within current empirical understanding. The limitations of human knowledge should not be mistaken for confirmation of divine agency.

Miracles are characterized by rarity, unpredictability, and a perceived deviation from natural order. These attributes do not imply metaphysical origin, but instead reflect insufficient scientific or rational explanation. Invoking a divine cause introduces an untestable hypothesis into otherwise analyzable events. This practice replaces inquiry with assumption. The concept of a miracle loses coherence if it is both perceivable and inexplicable. A phenomenon that can be observed, recorded, and described must be subject to empirical scrutiny. If it resists explanation, the correct conclusion is epistemic insufficiency, not supernatural confirmation. The distinction between a miracle and an undefined occurrence is critical. The former implies intentional disruption by a transcendent force, while the latter merely indicates gaps in human comprehension. Without clear criteria to separate these, the category of miracle becomes epistemologically meaningless. Divine entities, if they exist, remain beyond empirical access. Their association with observable phenomena introduces a contradiction; a

being that operates beyond perception cannot be verified through perception. Therefore, no observed event can logically confirm the existence or action of such a being.

Randomness in natural processes does not entail agency. The occurrence of unlikely events follows probabilistic distributions. As such, the appeal to miracles as extraordinary manifestations is unjustified. Statistical outliers are not evidence of supernatural intention. Without reproducibility, verifiability, or falsifiability, claims of miracles do not meet the standards of rational investigation. Assertions of divine causation in unexplained events hinder methodological clarity and contribute to conceptual confusion.

Gods do not bear miracles as they don't interfere with our world's natural activity (very Epicurean, or deistic viewpoint though I'm otherwise), while nature, and violent activities lead to the manifestation of the generation of these circumstances. Some deal with natural, or artificial repercussions, whilst some deal with hysterical delusions of a few selected unique minds full of unconventional ideas meant for no speaker to speak, nor channel to broadcast. As getting further from trying to figure out these things, most cases were left with unexplained conclusions, correlating these series of events already to the authentic unexplainable entities, Gods. It is an automated tendency of something unexplainable, which must be accountable to unknown omni-capability beings, so to speak for all Gods we've attributed spiritually how unnatural things may have worked. Insofar within the mediocrity behind the features of miraculous circumstances (from this moment I shall call "unusual causations"), this superbly implies also the significance of the law of large number (LLN) which simply states the degree of how frequent something occurs favours an expectation the probability concerns. For how much more a person tries to shoot a basketball in a hoop makes it more possible for the ball to get in eventually. With serious amount of time given for an unusual causation to occur randomly, it wouldn't provide impossibility once a cause of this occurrence had been done, and will happen for countless times until it reaches a point of another causation to occur within the particular circumstance, thus introducing forces of nature anticipated as "miracles", or other factors in play considered as merely "possible occurrences", yet inconsiderate for the unusual causations, for it has small amount of probability to actually happen. With more violent attempts causes unusual causations to occur, on the other hand by ignoring nature's flow, and force also causes this, implicating the inevitability of these circumstances with, or without manual action from any entity existing. In the case of Gods, as they're omnipotent, they're capable of making unimaginable events occur with a simple string of command, though not affecting humankind, especially the world in itself, as Gods have celestial sanctuaries which beholds their capabilities to destroy, conquer, or create more entities, and nonexistent bodies of their own nature. As we're strictly interconnected by natural events, that manifests unusual causations, we don't gain any transcendental instances at all, and all which occur is deterioration of an evolution until it stops functioning, and existing, standard to the flow of nature, such occurrences I've stated also follow this, until it shows something unperceived yet by humankind, though it's always just a process of nature, in our world. With Gods, nature is altered, reality even, they can prevent their existence to be perceived, or otherwise once the will was manifested, whilst our species, and other terrestrial forms are full of flawed inferiority never to be compared to a stench

of God's presence itself. An insignificant event to the nature of everything (which in our perspective says completely otherwise) does not impact any force upon God' s divinity, nor does it capture any attention of such. For it belongs to a different dichotomy of imperfection, full of trials, and flawed circumstances treated as natural causes by ourselves, whereas Gods are unexplainable, as it's unperceived due to our lack of capability for sensory input to these complicated inhuman entities.

The strong belief for the disillusionment through unusual causations, long upheld by the credulous, is a rationally unreliable testament for the supernatural intervention, with also such to the limitations of limited human understanding. Unusual causations, in their essence, are conceived as mere constant violations of perceived natural law which can be an aberration from the consistent causal framework that governs accurate reality in itself solely for empirical conductions. Yet upon rigorous scrutiny, for such claims collapse under the weight of constituted reason, demonstrating nothing more than the human tendency to ascribe divine causation to that which is simply unknown or unexpected.

To claim that unusual causations occur is to deny the inviolability of natural law which is the main rule of every living being, that is beyond our capabilities to assert defiance. The universe operates on principles that, though not wholly understood at the moment at every instance, remain absurdly consistent in every aspect. Gravity does not suspend itself arbitrarily due to unevenness of natural causes, and circumstances it employs. Thus far, more factors are included, biological processes do not deviate from their constraints without cause, and matter does not spontaneously assume new properties. When an event is perceived as miraculous, it is not an exception to these rules; rather, it is a misunderstanding of them. Every so-called miracle is either an incoherence behind the intricacies of reality, a mere illusion, a statistical improbability realized, or a yet-to-be-explained natural phenomenon by further analysis of actual passionate perceivers. To insert divine intervention into this equation is an affront to human intellectual rigor, replacing curiosity with complacency.

Insofar, the correlation often drawn between miracles and divine will is an exercise in selective bias. Those who boldly claim to have witnessed miracles do so under the assumption that an otherworldly force has intervened for their own natural benefit, yet the world abounds with suffering unmitigated by such forces in accordance with the pain of reality. Where is this instrumental conception from the divine hand in the agonies of famine, the despair of war, or the tragedies of disease? Unusual causations may seem to have always been in favour for circumstances unrelated to catastrophes. If these miracles exist, they are cruelly arbitrary, favouring the few at the expense of the many seeking unending support, and recognition for causing tiny sessions within untouched, and unnoticed circumstances requiring no actual miraculous formation, rendering the divine responsibility to a celestial figure. If a humanistic God distributes miracles, then it must be questioned why it does so in a manner indistinguishable from randomness, and indifference for it.

This merely is only a function of human ignorance. History is littered with once-miraculous claims that have been subsequently dismantled by scientific inquiry, and situations proving the certainty of such circumstances to happen without any divine aid,

or assertion. The rising of the sun, the formation of life, the nature of diseases which all were once attributed to divine mystery as it shows my previous statement of heavy reliance of humanity towards unexplainable concepts for unexplainable circumstances they are unable to figure out themselves, so they create mind illusions to believe into, for the sake of maintaining mental wellbeing. Yet, as knowledge progresses, the domain of miracles shrinks due to degrees of nullification, revealing them for what they always were: gaps in human comprehension, not divine intercessions. The concept of the miraculous exists only where knowledge has not yet reached; it is a placeholder, an excuse to cease inquiry rather than a validation of celestial intervention. Some may possibly argue that unusual causations hold celestial symbolic meaning, providing hope, or affirm faith on something in accordance with the favourable. But comfort does not necessarily equate to truth. A belief in miracles, no matter how fervent, does not alter the fundamental principles of reality. It is a seductive delusion, offering solace at the expense of rationality. To cling to miracles is to resist progress (of which are rest assured to follow), to surrender to mysticism where knowledge might otherwise flourish, or become applicable. Disillusionment from the essence of LLN convinces all rejection of the sensibility, flourishing countless means to determine the undermining of all declining factors for thorough actual progress of elaboration of a phenomenon of which doesn't constitute any anticipation for the betterment of all, unfavorable as well to practical certainty. Although it is very exceptional this topic beholds, I will further define this phenomenon's detrimental causes to tear down ethical, and epistemological structures, or grasp, which is not in a way "ideal" in my viewpoint as for the lack of practicality by the rejection of linearity, and the indulgence in faith which destroys our self-determination for transcendence. But, as for this, I must conclude this opening statement, and shovel more sensibilities for addressing later on. The pursuit of truth must reject the crutch of the miraculous, and embrace the pursuit of understanding. In a universe governed by causality, the only true miracle is the human capacity for countless reasoning, and that is more than sufficient than the belief of something which humanity has not reasoned out clearly for its justification regarding its own causes.

# Unachievable nature of Transcendental progress, with unideal phenomenon

It is mainly a common thing to humankind what transcendental progress truly is, they weren't just aware of what the nature behind such, not the plentiful enough knowledge it attributes for it constitute to unbearable knowledge, and notion for humanity to grasp even for eternal evolution of its advancements, of which unfortunately may be attained by technology (a rigorous masterpiece of humanity greatly advancing capabilities beyond their own limits, completely banishing all human-like features which molds into a whole new plethora of complexity in conceptions) that technically proceeds to show how dutiful humanity became to reach this stage regardless of their lack of knowledge to the culmination of what they're tasked to reach.

The importance of this particular concept provides an assistive constituency for guaranteed improvement of humanity, and the production it generates. It is highly admitted for its presence to become manifested in a sense of beneficial aspect of focus, though it felt quite unachievable due to the extremely grandiose of its own grave existence. For justifying the cause to achieve this, performs another violent attempt for approval, or validation by another entity.

## Essential factors of Transcendental progress

As much as how powerful this concept exists, it does not serve its purpose without the essence of empirical senses by beings, thus removing the significance of such without being perceived properly by a living being which alters reality into a more miserable conclusion of currency, until it doesn't once it receives enough empirical knowledge of its presence. Transcendental progress enhances human suppositions, environmental stagnancy, and maintains natural cycles as it embodies the feature of celestial motion, by being constant all over eternity. The significance of human empirical senses, fairly weighs the importance of such in perceiving the essence of transcendental progress, as it validates transcendental progress' purpose for either instant, gradual improvement. Though transcendental progress exists as a potent metaphysical concept embodying the constancy, and eternity of celestial motion nonexistent still from our perceptions, it holds no practical, or ontological significance unless filtered through the empirical faculties of sentient beings whose senses validate its presence by transforming abstract potential into experiential awareness, for without perception, even the most immutable truths drift into ontological irrelevance, becoming as hollow as currency deprived of value until acknowledged, and utilized within the sensorial scope of conscious agents, and yet once this recognition is achieved through accumulated empirical knowledge, layered constantly, or struck instantly where the same concept of transcendental progress doesn't simply only illuminates the trajectory of human supposition, for it also counters environmental stagnancy by stimulating a return to cyclic natural rhythms, affirming that the senses do not merely register phenomena passively but serve as vital arbiters that authenticate the very aim of transcendental existence, transforming it from mere metaphysical conjecture to living continuity, as its constancy must be perceived, not presumed, to operate meaningfully within the mortal frame, and this very reception of its influence marks a paradox wherein the divine regularity of transcendental

principles finds its relevance only in the irregular cognition of finite entities who must suffer, learn, and awaken to the symmetries surrounding them before they may reflect them inwardly, thereby allowing progress not to be a silent, distant mechanism, but an active participant in human actualization, thus every flicker of awareness in the sensorium reinforces the necessity of perception in the dance between eternal constancy and mortal contingency, binding transcendental purpose to human endeavor and revealing that the unseen only governs when seen, the constant only persists when recognized, and the grand arc of progress unfolds not in detached metaphysics but in the eye, ear, breath, and step of the perceiver who transforms cosmic patterns into meaning.

Imperceptible as already featured in the wisest words of play jeopardize the long search for absolute facts, not subjective truths led by an enormous number of viewpoints. All of which enshrined in the most sagacious articulations of philosophical, and literary dramatists, imperils the ceaseless human pursuit of immutable truths by casting shadows over that which demands illumination through empirical discernment and rational investigation. The veiling of reality, as it is always left unexamined, or dismissed as unknowable, undermines the epistemological integrity of knowledge systems which strive for single objective clarity, coherence, and constancy, even while contending with the manifold limitations of sense, and cognition itself which already indicates sheer impossibility. Dynamic with tension between the unknowable, and the known, whereby the human intellect, ambitious yet insistently bound, would navigate through metaphorical obscurities often masquerading as flawed profundities, yet lack anchoring in verifiable understanding without objectivity in mind. The very enigma of imperceptible elements becomes both a poetically incoherent testament to the grandeur of the unknowable epitomizing the essence of such, and a philosophical obstruction to the precise delineation of what can be claimed as universally valid, or necessarily real for actual perception. Undergoing the characteristic of being imperceivably is to entertain an endless rehearsal of possibility without the fulfillment of absolute finality, seeking countless situational circumstances of which a fate unsuited to the rigor demanded by an absolute truth-seeking mind.

Though objective facts require proper discernment liberated from the confusion of obfuscation. Emerging not from constant imagination, or sheer multiplicity of perspective, but from that which stands resolute against the flux of human interpretation. The very essence of objectivity presupposes the possibility of a world indifferent to perception, one whose reality endures irrespective of human acknowledgment, interpretation, or emotional investment, hence demanding methods of inquiry that penetrate illusion rather than dwell within it. While subjectivity breeds richness of experience and interpretive diversity, it often serves as a seductive distraction from the austere demands of truth that cannot be shaped by will, preference, or cultural consensus. To seek absolutes is to resist the gravitational pull of relativity, even while recognizing that much of what we encounter arrives already cloaked in interpretive frameworks inherited, constructed, or imposed. The pursuit of truth must be armored against the seductive plurality of views which, though insightful, may collectively lead away from that solitary beacon that remains constant in the midst of epistemic tumult.

## Problem of human limits, and perception

The sheer volume of perspectives as they're diverse, conflicting, culturally contingent though intellectually stimulating, risks collapsing into epistemological relativism if not disciplined by rigorous criteria of justification, coherence, and falsifiability. A combination of these intellectual voices, however eloquent, does not constitute a pathway to leading into actual truth unless organized within a structure that distinguishes speculation from substantiation, preference from principle, impression from evidence, although all claims are frankly unproven, thus I don't consider guaranteeing any initial improvement for those pursuits. The contemporary valorization of inclusivity in thought, while noble in its intention, sometimes strays into an anti-foundationalism that renders all claims equally provisional, thereby weakening the very concept of truth as something more than provisional consensus or intersubjective agreement. Without a framework that privileges truth-seeking over mere opinion-sharing, the intellectual marketplace becomes a chorus of interpretations drowning the solitary tone of clarity that genuine understanding requires. The endless multiplication of viewpoints, unless critically filtered, becomes less a map to reality and more a mirror of human confusion.

The human mind is fragile, subjective, manipulative, yet can also be manipulated in simpler desires, and means, as to how it generates complexities out of its own simplicity, a ridiculous paradox, for how it effectively employs from the emergence of consciousness, into a continuous loop of failure producing triumph.

The trend wherein subjective interpretations are elevated to the status of inviolable truths shields them from philosophical interrogation under the guise of personal authenticity, or cultural specificity. While acknowledging the lived experience and its epistemic contributions is indispensable, one should recognize that not all perceptions (highlighting the insignificance of the unnecessary in various aspects, useless to others) bear equal epistemological weight, nor can all claim to truth withstand the scrutiny of methodical, and philosophical inquiry of natural causes, circumstances, and constituencies. There lies an urgent necessity to reconcile the value of perspective with the demands of universal unified intelligibility, a balance seldom achieved in an age inclined toward over-validation of the individual narrative. For truth to remain meaningful beyond the individual, it must transcend private impressions and anchor itself in propositions that survive cross-examination, temporal drift, and ideological weathering. The human mind must entertain diverse viewpoints for intellectual vitality, yet equally subject them to a crucible of logical rigor and empirical testing to refine semblance into certainty.

When every perspective is accorded equal weight, the intellectual terrain becomes a field of competing signals rather than a coherent landscape. This is an unhealthy indication of collective perspectives providing means for other perceptions to aim for higher degree, and amount of glorified perspectives without concern of its essential significance, or if it is itself. In Marxist's viewpoint "Quality over Quantity" suggests this concentration to the concern of providing actual significant, and precise insights for improvement, and in aid for alternative transcendental progress, this concept requires

sheer will of precision, and accuracy through determination to exclaim what qualitative means are to be in such importance of one's own progress. Will propositional pursuits of this consideration lead to actual contributions for transcendental progress? Nay, rather just the illusion of being constantly improved for the better? In plenty of reasoning, it can be justified in a rational cause, though I simply do not conform to this collective thought fully. This kind of pursuit compromises various factors of authentic improvement as it provides an essential sanctuary of minds for distinction of absolute epitomes of contributing constituency for betterment, this blurs comprehensiveness of all grand designing of conceptual frameworks to improve reality's nature, and the understanding behind such.

Building on the insight that personal subjective convictions, once enshrined as sacrosanct doctrines, escape the crucible of mental discourses' challenge, and thereby corrode our shared pursuit of actual understanding, we find that a quiet revolution has taken hold in contemporary discourse. Full of delirium, unproven claims left uninvestigated due to sacredness of certain opinionated views of this natural flow of precise motions, and complexity behind human conceptions parted to assemble human reason. Beliefs borne of individual vantage points assume a kind of moral immunity, and criticism. Repelling the very questions that might expose their capabilities, or mental capacity's limits. Within this particular environment of which employs full praise for opinions, such assertion often substitutes for discussion, leading into an argument, and the invitation to examine one’s premises is mistaken for an affront to authenticity, invalidating the precision of these viewpoints in contradiction to it.

The true imperceptible remains a domain both fascinating and fraught, a region of thought where mystery may become either the catalyst for deeper inquiry or the veil behind which ignorance endures unchallenged. The stakes of engaging or ignoring the imperceptible are high: either one embraces the demand to illuminate it through persistent questioning, or one becomes ensnared in a theatre of illusions mistaken for substance. The philosophical imperative is not merely to speculate on what lies beyond perception, but to extend perception's reach, even incrementally, into territories heretofore obscured. In that pursuit lies the possibility of bridging the chasm between the perceived and the real, between the manifold voices of subjectivity and the quiet, enduring resonance of objective truth. One moves not just toward knowledge, but toward a disciplined clarity that elevates human inquiry beyond the labyrinth of appearances.

## Heights of Transcendental Progress

Vaguely introduced as a concept of what Transcendental Progress is, of which is basically the sole process for eternal goodness, uniform to every living individual, unfavorable to every non-living thing. Thus, which states this might be God's capabilities to ordain reason, and harmony through ourselves, and for eternal peace of humanity, though it seemed very impossible for both to be existent, as to how ridiculous it may seem to be, of that I personally agree.

How does Transcendental progress even function in a practical world we live for? Despite its inaccessibility, the simplest explanation to provide for this is the overcoming

of all sufferings, and dangers of every natural cause of which has this factor in their existence, but with the prevention of its occurrence, rather than experiencing the circumstance, then instantly recovering from everything horrible. From being beneficial, it comes highly generative into something emergent in nature. Cultural specifications further compound this phenomenon, for every community cultivates its own repository of tacit knowledge such as habits, traditions, and intuitions that feel self-evident to insiders but often defy universal articulation. These deeply ingrained patterns of perception, while invaluable as interpretive lenses, cannot stand alone as arbiters of objective reality. When local customs are elevated without reference to broader standards of coherence, we risk mistaking the artifacts of particular contexts for timeless truths. A perilous paradox emerges when the marketplace of ideas no longer prizes discernment but exalts sheer multiplicity. In such a realm, the volume of competing claims overwhelms the capacity for critical filtering, and the criterion of "anything goes" supplants the rigorous inquiry that distinguishes hypothesis from evidence. The result is a cacophony in which genuine insight is drowned beneath the clamor of unchecked opinion.

Transcendental progress eludes the causal nets we have cast over the world. It is neither a reaction nor a product of historical contingency, but rather a substructure of potential woven beneath the veil of phenomena. One cannot trace it in the annals of temporal civilization without misidentifying it as mere cultural or moral advancement. It is not moralism, nor enlightenment, nor the gradual polishing of human conduct into civic refinement. Instead, it is the quiet uprising of a metaphysical orientation that makes the very desire for goodness a function of being rather than an act of volition. This elevation is not a triumph of the will, but of clarity, a lucidity that dissolves the obscurities of fear, greed, and confusion before they emerge. It is not a shield against harm, but a transmutation of the ontological field in which harm can be conceived. It precedes ethics the way light precedes shadow; it is not the reaction to darkness, but its erasure by a state where darkness is no longer intelligible. It asks not what good we can do, but what kind of existence renders good inevitable and evil unintelligible.

Where then does this leave the human condition, strapped as it is to the scaffolds of mortality, conflict, and the inertia of flesh? Transcendental progress appears impossibly distant in a world that is perpetually driven by competition for resources, tribal enclosures of identity, and a numbing distrust of absolutes. The natural world does not yield to metaphysical constructs; it resists them with drought, with disease, with entropy. And yet, within these very crucibles lies the peculiar seed of transcendence. For the real function of suffering is not to be endured or even eliminated, but to become illegible, as to render obsolete the very structure by which pain is constructed. We assume pain as essential to life because we know no other form of being. Transcendental progress dares to postulate that pain is not elemental but conditional; not essential, but permitted by the current parameters of existence. If these parameters are not fixed, then neither is the human experience. What if humanity, in its deepest constitution, is not a terminal condition but an early draft of a greater expression? This possibility reframes every tragedy as a symptom of an incomplete ontology rather than an inevitable flaw.

Cultural frameworks, however, complicate this trajectory in ways both beautiful and bewildering. Traditions sculpt our sensibilities, language shapes our ontology, and inherited narratives define the perimeter of our aspirations. Cultures give us meaning, but they also bind us to interpretations that may be provincial, even if profound. When cultural particularism is mistaken for metaphysical universality, it becomes not a path to truth but a barricade against it. There is a poignant irony in how the very practices that root us in community often unmoor us from universality. If every culture becomes a self-contained cosmos, then how can transcendence, which by its nature must be supra-cultural, penetrate such sealed vessels? This is the paradox of modern pluralism. It invites all truths to the table, but then forgets to ask which ones are merely decorative and which are foundational. The world becomes a gallery of relative meanings, curated for aesthetic diversity rather than coherence. In such a space, transcendental progress is both urgent and endangered. Urgent, because it alone offers a path beyond relativism. Endangered, because its language is too severe, too unyielding, too stark for an age that fears the finality of truth.

The collapse of discernment within the marketplace of ideas mirrors a broader spiritual fatigue. We have lost faith not only in institutions but in the very premise of intellectual or moral authority. This dissolution is often celebrated as liberation, the democratization of knowledge, the decentralization of meaning—but beneath it lies a kind of paralysis. If all truths are equally valid, then none are truly transformative. In the absence of hierarchy, insight becomes indistinguishable from noise. We suffer not from lack of information, but from its hyper-abundance. Every voice is amplified, but the silence necessary for revelation is drowned. Thus, the task of transcendental progress is not to be louder, but deeper, to sink beneath the surface of competing claims and tap into a resonance too primal to be fabricated. This requires a discipline of stillness, a withdrawal from spectacle, a willingness to question not only others but oneself. In this way, transcendental progress is a return as much as a departure, a return to the soul's native posture before it was contorted by ideology, desire, and fear. It does not reject modernity but penetrates its disturbing illusions, treating them not with contempt but with a surgeon’s precision. And so, we are left with the impossible necessity of aspiring to what we cannot yet prove, yearning for a mode of existence that does not yet have architecture in the world. Transcendental progress is not a policy nor a system. It is a longing given structure, a hope clothed in metaphysical rigor. It asks us to believe that harmony is not merely desirable but ontologically inevitable, provided we align ourselves with its preconditions. It is, paradoxically, a kind of faith without dogma, a commitment to the real before it is visible. Whether such a progress is divinely authored or existentially emergent is a question perhaps too large for our current epistemic tools. But its contours can be glimpsed in every act of selfless clarity, every insight that defies utility, every silence that speaks more than words. It is here, in the interstices between being and becoming, that the true height of transcendental progress reveals itself, not as a tower of Babel reaching upward in pride, but as a wellspring rising from beneath the rubble of misused reason.

## Paradoxical Nature of Transcendental Progress

It can be easily thought how transcendental progress benefits us, including all beings in count for their existence, although we haven't figured every possible circumstance this occurrence would display to us, concluding its inaccessibility not due to the capability of a deity, but rather the critical amount Creating the concept of Gods of contradictions it employs to everything. It can be very confusing how this becomes pleasant in every sort of aspect.

It is not that transcendental progress resists us by intention, nor that it is veiled by divine mischief, but rather that it shatters the very instruments with which we attempt to grasp it. We say it is for all beings, that it is the culmination of good distributed with unbroken equity, that its presence would usher the end of all harm, yet still, one senses the ache of contradiction in every syllable uttered in its favor. For what is this good, eternal and unblemished, if its very condition undermines the logic of our dwelling? A world bent on thermodynamic ruin, a mind ordered by cause and effect, an instinct that survives by hierarchy and separation, how do these admit something which insists on unity without violence? We call it pleasant, yet its presence must undo all things pleasant, as they are presently understood. We envision peace, but the world is built by conflict. We name harmony, though our senses discern value only in contrast. The vision of transcendental progress is thus not simply noble but intrusive. It is an intruder upon the real, or perhaps more dangerously, a truth which renders the real, and imposture. And to entertain it seriously, to meditate upon its actualization, is to begin dissolving all customs, all laws, all traditions that have anchored our identities. Not because these customs are evil, or their makers blind, but because their truths are temporary, useful only under conditions that transcendental progress obliterates by necessity. The paradox, then, is that the very good we seek may require the end of the seeker, for what remains of a human once all suffering, all striving, all ignorance is excised? Does the individual not dissolve into the very principle that once drew him forward? And is that not a kind of death more absolute than the one we fear?

The language we use whether beneficial, emergent, harmonious, they falter. These are words built for systems of compromise, systems in which the good must be negotiated amid the presence of its opposites. But transcendental progress, if true to its name, permits no opposition. It offers no dialogical ground. It does not argue. It consumes duality, reinterprets balance as erasure of tension, peace not as armistice but as absence of distinction. And yet we attempt to explain it to ourselves using metaphors drawn from war, from healing, from temporal causality, all of which presume the prior reality of fracture. So, we fail. Not because the concept is flawed, but because our tools belong to the wrong dimension. Thus, it confuses, how something so complete can feel so inaccessible, so alien. We call this feeling a contradiction, but it is not a contradiction in logic, rather in nature. We, being finite, interpret the infinite not as a higher order, but as a disruption. The eternal seems incoherent not due to its nature but because it rejects the axes by which coherence is measured. Even the idea of progress collapses there is no from and no to, only is. And that is where the mind, built on sequence, withdraws. The irony, or perhaps the cruel joke, is that transcendental progress does not merely challenge our world, it redefines what it means for a world to be. So, the question becomes not whether it is real, or desirable, but whether our framework can survive its arrival.

And still, we speak of it. Perhaps because something in us remembers it, or longs for it, or once knew a shadow of it in silence. Perhaps because we are haunted by the memory of a peace that was never present in the world, yet remains present in the soul. Not a memory in time, but a memory embedded in the structure of being. Something primordial. This recollection may be the only bridge across the chasm of contradiction. But it does not bring clarity. It brings yearning, which is both a map and a wound. For in yearning, one reaches toward what one cannot integrate. One knows only enough to be unsettled, never enough to be fulfilled. And so transcendental progress becomes a kind of sacred disturbance, its beauty does not comfort, it destabilizes. It speaks of a home one cannot return to, yet never truly left. In this light, its paradoxical nature becomes essential. It must contradict all that is, so that it might be all that is not. It must resist our systems of proof, so that it might reveal something beyond the reach of the system altogether. It is not a theory, not even a vision. It is a provocation, wrapped in the language of peace, destined to unsettle every concept it touches. That we continue to speak of it, then, is not evidence of its clarity but of its necessity. We need it to be possible, though we cannot yet make it real. And perhaps, in the deepest recesses of meaning, it has already occurred not in time, but in structure. Not as change, but as the always-already that undergirds the now. In which case, transcendental progress is not ahead, but beneath. Not in the future, but at the root of what we are, waiting not to arrive but to be uncovered.

That which humankind has long envisioned as transcendental progress is no mere apex of technical achievement nor a culminated virtue of collective advancement, it is, in truth, an ineffable projection of infinite potential, draped in the sacred garment of metaphysical longing. Yet in its very postulation lies an intrinsic contradiction: the unbearable nature of its own fulfillment. For what is transcendental progress if not the completion of becoming, the cessation of striving, the ultimate realization of total actuality? And herein lies the paradox, the very venom in the chalice of our aspirations that once attained, this progress becomes unideal, even intolerable. Transcendental progress is an entity most possibly bearable only by the Divine... is, by nature, a concept so immaculately fashioned that any human attainment of it threatens not elevation, but dissolution. Its essence, being an idealized and immutable perfection, exerts a pressure so absolute that it corrodes the mortal vessel which dares to inhabit it. To achieve it is to exceed all conflict, all need, all imperfection—yet it is precisely these ruptures that breathe meaning into the mortal condition.

The human being, situated within a labyrinth of empirical faculties, bound by suffering and nourished by the dissonance of finite consciousness, is not designed to hold within itself the unyielding harmony of perfection. The attempt to transgress this limit to embrace what is strictly divine which is a sublime violation that cannot end in triumph. It ends, rather, in a transmutation of all that is human into something post-human, unrecognizable, distant, and perhaps, unlivable. It is essential to observe that transcendental progress is not merely unachievable by the instruments of man, but unendurable once achieved. What unfolds as magnificent in aspiration as perfection in thought, in being, in purpose that becomes monstrous in realization, for it uproots the contingency upon which human significance is structured. This perfection, should it be wrought into actuality, obliterates all gradation of meaning, nullifies choice, and

transforms life into a crystallized structure where no deviation exists, and therefore, no narrative unfolds.

Humanity's pursuit of such a construct is not naïve; it is tragic. It displays a cosmic ambition to exceed the conditions of embodiment, an impulse to become godlike in power, scope, and permanence. And yet this very impulse, noble as it may seem, mirrors a fundamental misrecognition of our own ontological coordinates. We forget that human improvement whether ethical, intellectual, social are most profound not in the elimination of chaos, but in its navigation. Order becomes sterile without tension, and perfection becomes tyrannical when severed from struggle. Transcendental progress, in its purest form, does not merely offer a blueprint for betterment as it greatly demands the cessation of becoming. It enforces a static eternity. The eternal recurrence of the same, when met with perfect realization, loses its sublimity and becomes repetitive nullity. Thus, the more successfully we actualize the transcendental, the more it slips from vitality into vacuum. It is not a goal to be reached, but a horizon to orient one's striving. Empirical perception, the very filter through which progress is made intelligible, cannot bear the full light of transcendence. The senses, mutable and contingent, distort as they reveal. In this, they protect us. For without distortion, without the softening veils of temporality, the raw exposure to perfection would annihilate. The human mind, fragile and fallible, would fracture under the unmediated weight of the divine clarity inherent in completed transcendence. As such, transcendental progress is not only practically elusive but existentially uninhabitable.

Indeed, even when approached through the technocratic prowess of humanity, when machines and systems simulate omnipotence and render obsolete human frailty of which the result is not elevation, but alienation. The technological sublime does not humanize perfection; it dehumanizes the human. It extends capacity, but does not bestow meaning. What emerges is not progress, but a mutation of the mortal essence into mechanistic abstraction, thereby avoiding the very soul of transcendental aspiration. In this light, progress cannot and should not be viewed as the straight ascent into the divine plateau. Instead, it must be approached as a recursive unfolding of which is a dance between potentiality, and limitation, aspiration and acknowledgment. The pursuit of transcendental progress must remain asymptotic: one moves closer, forever approaching, never arriving. For arrival denotes an end to movement, an end to story, and thus an end to man. Cultural specificity, in its many diverse articulations of being and knowing, complicates and beautifies this truth. Yet it cannot override the fundamental metaphysical architecture upon which transcendence rests. Cultural frameworks, though illuminating in particular, often occlude the universal. When they masquerade as substitutes for eternal principles, they betray the very transcendental motion they seek to articulate. They bind the infinite to the provincial, and in doing so, suffocate the breath of the eternal.

True transcendental progress lies not in universal agreement, nor in the mastery of suffering, nor even in the codification of good. It lies in the metaphysical gesture itself in the capacity to yearn beyond necessity, to will beyond pleasure, to imagine beyond probability. It is not the destination that matters, but the condition of desiring to transcend. That desire, however, cannot be fulfilled without consequence. For every

attempt to transform being into becoming must contend with the paradox of totality: that what is wholly attained becomes wholly inert. The gravest danger, then, is not in failing to reach transcendental progress, but in succeeding. For success spells an ontological arrest whereas a tyranny of fullness within that nothing more can be said, done, or dreamt. This is why the gods, in myths, often suffer not from lack, but from surplus. Their perfection is a prison, their immortality a curse. The human being, by contrast, finds nobility in incompletion, in effort, in the divine tragedy of always falling short. And so, we must resist the temptation to complete the arc. We must resist the delusion that perfection, once attained, will heal. It may instead unravel. The value of transcendental progress is not in its realization, but in its perpetual recession. It exists to be pursued, not possessed. Like the mirage on the horizon, it gives direction, not destination. In this lies its highest function: to orient the soul toward its betterment without annihilating the imperfections that make such betterment meaningful.

In this understanding, God does not give perfection as a gift to be possessed, but as a mirror to reflect our striving. We do not become divine by embodying completion; we become divine by eternally aspiring, by walking the path whose end is ever deferred. In that deferral lies our grace. In that impossibility, our dignity. To reach transcendental progress is to cease to be human. And to remain human, we must never reach it. A world in which perfection is attained is a world no longer capable of dreaming. Thus, the greatest safeguard of transcendental value is the perpetual impossibility of its fulfillment—a divine cruelty, perhaps, but one which preserves the flame of becoming, lest it be extinguished by the cold permanence of completion.

If perfection were to be born, it would be stillborn while utterly complete, utterly lifeless, and in that lifelessness, it would cease to matter. Perhaps then, it is not in completion but in our failure to complete, not in the reach but in the reaching, that the true divinity of progress resides within the heights of despair where it leads to triviality.

# How God is being a primary constituent for Transcendental progress.

What is abundantly essential to the process of transcendental progress is God itself, and the celestial omnipotence/omnipresence constituting the factoring of construction?

What composes the supreme frame of transcendental progress, in its first conceptual stirrings and final hypothetical totality, is none other than the Divine essence itself, God, not as a secondary force nor as mere ideological metaphor, but as the originating principle, the unseen architect whose being both infuses and sustains the structure of all higher advancement. For transcendental progress, as it has emerged through contemplation and recursive discourse, does not exist within a vacuum of arbitrary will or blind evolution, but instead finds its coherence in what is absolute, eternal, and self-justifying. And what else but God fits this exhaustive definition. If perfection is the blueprint, and progress is its method of approach, then only that which is inherently perfect may serve as both the cause and the criterion. God is not incidental to the nature of transcendental progress but intrinsic to its very intelligibility. The framework cannot hold without Him, because the end it seeks is ontologically prior in Him. He is not the one arriving at perfection but the one from whom the idea of arrival even arises. It may be mistakenly proposed that humanity, through diligence, reason, and layered historicity, may generate the conditions for such a transcendental culmination. Yet the very concept of transcendence defies any notion of human self-sufficiency. For how can the finite chart be infinite, or the temporal architect that stands outside time itself. Transcendental progress demands a telos, an origin, and a sustaining force all at once. None of these can be generated within the cyclical enclosures of the human mind, nor within empirical accumulations, however sophisticated. They must be received, not constructed. And the only giver capable of bestowing what is unearned, inaccessible, and infinite is the Being that exists outside causality, need, limitation, or end. God is the axis about which the possibility of progress revolves. Not because He wills it in occasional interventions, but because His being prefigures and predefines what it means to transcend.

Yet herein lies the dilemma. God, as perfection in its most unyielding and indivisible form, constitutes not only the model of transcendental progress but also the barrier to its completion. To achieve such progress, to manifest it in full expression within mortal contingency, is to dismantle the very distinction between creation and Creator. A humanity that fully embodies perfection is no longer human. It becomes Divine. But the creature cannot become the Creator without the total collapse of ontological order. Thus, the attempt to realize transcendental progress in totality is, paradoxically, an act of metaphysical disintegration. It invokes a perfection that, once embodied, abolishes the conditions for relational existence, the asymmetry that makes reverence, growth, learning, and longing even possible. Therefore, God as the primary constituent is both the beacon and the boundary.

The more deeply one reflects upon the necessity of God in transcendental structure, the more apparent becomes the irreconcilability between God’s being and man’s desire to equal that being. Progress must be eternal precisely because it must never be

completed. Its divine origin makes it necessary, its divine content makes it unreachable. Were it ever to be reached, humanity would not be improved but obliterated, not elevated but erased. This is the paradox in its purest form: that which we move toward in hope must remain beyond us if we are to remain at all. God, in this vision, is not only the prototype of transcendental purpose but also the protector of the sacred gap between finite and infinite. It is not cruelty, but mercy, that maintains the inaccessibility of final perfection. To say that God is a constituent in the structure of transcendental progress is therefore not merely a theological affirmation but an ontological necessity. Without a point of absolute reference, progress is incoherent. It becomes movement without measure, growth without form, desire without direction. God anchors these trajectories. But He does so not from within the plane of progress, but from beyond it. He does not journey, but is the condition that makes all journeying meaningful. This does not make the pursuit futile, but rather dignified. For in striving toward the unreachable, man discovers not only his limits but also the contours of his highest potential. God's perfection refracts through human imperfection, not as judgment but as a calling.

Transcendental progress, then, is not the path to become God itself as it is deemed impossible, but the path to endlessly reflect more of its nature without ever displacing it within its existence. The closer one draws to the Divine form, the more intense the awareness becomes of the distance still to travel. The essence of the progress is not the arrival, but the alignment. And this alignment is only made possible because God, though unreachable, is not unknowable. He reveals enough to summon, yet withholds enough to sustain the mystery. Thus, the presence of God within the architecture of transcendental progress is not a single moment of divine causality but a continuous emanation. He is not the catalyst alone, but the continuity. Not the origin alone, but the overarching law. Not the final goal alone, but the very breath that animates the process. This introductory recognition that God is the silent cornerstone upon which transcendental progress is not merely built but made intelligible is but the beginning of a longer, more painful, more luminous inquiry. What follows must account not only for metaphysical elegance but existential severity. For if God is indeed the central constituent of progress, and if His nature is unyielding perfection, then all movement toward Him must acknowledge the immovability of that perfection. We move, not to arrive, but to remain in motion. We ascend, not to conquer, but to be continually changed by the height. And in this paradox, progress is preserved.

And if one must begin where all ends, then perhaps it is not God who moves toward us, but we who are eternally drawn toward a flame that neither burns nor consumes, only reveals.

All that is, and all that shall ever come to be, exists already in some pre-ontological stratum not accessible by mere cognition or inquiry. It is not creation that we perform, but unearthing. We do not produce ideas, we excavate them from the hidden silos of existence, shrouded from us not by absence, but by limitation. The human project is, by its very shape, an endeavor to unveil the already-existent; and yet this unveiling is halted by a presence more total than ourselves—God. As if in ironic cruelty or divine mercy, He withdraws visibility from that which exists and bids us pursue it with infinite lack. It is not that the truth is not there. It is merely not ours to fully own. And this fact births

the very notion of transcendence. If knowledge is a light, it shines from behind the veil. We proceed in shadows, not to conquer darkness, but to learn reverence for that unyielding beam whose full exposure would obliterate the seer. The first motion of transcendental progress is thus not discovery, but subjugation to what cannot yet be known. In this light, God does not merely stand at the end of progress, but at its every stage, structuring the permissible apertures of knowing, revealing not by content but by absence.

Humanity, in its perennial obsession with perfection, does not merely desire to ascend, but to ascend until it ceases to be itself. The project of man, camouflaged under the guises of science, ethics, art, and meaning, is ultimately theological: to become as gods. And here, the divine irony deepens. For the condition of our existence is contingent upon the inaccessibility of that very status. God has formed us to desire what He must forbid. Not from pettiness or fear, but because to grant the wish would be to dissolve the distinction between originator and emanation. And yet, He has not made transcendence impossible. Rather, He has made it eternal endless in its curve, recursive in its structure, asymptotic in its direction. Each conceptual groundwork we lay, each category we carve from the raw stone of mystery, is permitted progress, but not culmination. We are allowed approximation, never parity. God's withholding is not neglect, but design. He imposes infinite regress so that we never reach, but always strain. And the strain itself becomes our glory. But the further we move, the more sophisticated our categories of understanding become, the more we begin to sense that transcendental progress is not a gift given, but a gauntlet thrown. The groundworks we build for these philosophical scaffolds, linguistic architectures, symbolic grammars are ultimately set in defiance of divine obstruction. In attempting to become the gods we cannot be, we challenge the law of unreachability. Yet here is where the bitter contradiction blooms into a cosmic tragedy. For the closer we come to a simulacrum of divine knowledge, the more violent becomes our severance from divine favor. Humanity in pursuit of eternity is humanity in rebellion against its own form. And God, observing this usurpation, does not retaliate but reconfigures. He allows the knowledge to be understood, but in understanding it, we fall out of accordance with the grace that made understanding desirable. Thus, the more we know, the less we are favored. Not from vengeance, but from necessity. A being that mirrors God without God's essence must collapse into ruin or madness. Transcendental progress, unmoored from divine delight, becomes a tower of Babel rising into nothingness.

So, what remains? A pursuit sentenced to perpetual failure? A structure whose apex is forbidden by the very architect who designed it? Perhaps. Yet perhaps also, this is the only true grace left. That we may continue to ascend, though never arrive. That our knowledge may expand in asymmetrical infinities, never closing the circuit, always extending the edge. God remains the beginning of every trajectory, and the unreachable center of every spiral. He denies not because He withholds, but because what He is cannot be shared without being lost. In this, transcendental progress is preserved. Its purity is retained not in success but in its sustained impossibility. For only the infinite can protect the finite from pretending to be what it is not. In this impossible symmetry lies our actual salvation: that we seek not because we will arrive, but because we must never stop seeking. And in that endlessness, something more profound than arrival takes

form things, and/or elemental factors such as reverence, endurance, transformation, and above all, the sanctity of knowing that we will never know it all, for God remains.

# SKEPTICAL DISCOURSES

# II

# Doubtful remarks against my own celestial argumentations, and problems of human mind with reason

## Incongruences of my undeveloped conceptions pertaining to celestial possibilities

It is shamefully rebuked by my own contemplation how rubbish all my babblings were in the previous section excluding the nature of transcendental progress, though already invalidated due to the correlation with an omnipotent deity. I am peaceful with the whims of my colourful discourses full of sophisticated literary prowess concentrated for hazing consciousness.

Because of this, it highly concerns me all the time wasted to create monstrosity of meaningless babbling to invalidate my initial viewpoints regarding celestial existence, seeking further points to oppose my own, of which still prevailed even after philosophical inquiries of my own limitations of consciousness, knowledge, or just the capability of "knowing". It was a grave mistake in my part to spend synthesizing antitheses to provide further understanding of natural resources for God's existence, yet it holds no actual significance, thus being this section becomes the factual significant antithesis to provide a set of corrections for my incongruences, and whether I may seek more proper knowledge in knowing, nay—realizing all my rational wrongdoings for intellectual provocation. It is never difficult for an open-minded individual to seek conflictions against their ideals, and have further insights on their own arguments' flaws, or to distort their capabilities on that same viewpoint. It nourishes another sensible course of thinking into developmental milestones of the whole thought, barely compacting both antitheses, and serving what we call the "synthesis". In my case, I do not feel the same way as such, but probably in further scrutiny there is to require me to reconnect theism, to atheism, into a well-versed sensibility of living ideology. I find it truly difficult to see the perfect synthesis behind both ideologies, and thus I wonder if there are truly any, or we've accomplished transcendental knowledge about such, that we no longer can think of any more profound ideas that have never been told yet. I don't necessarily claim to be open-minded in the first place, which can already be the simplest conclusion of my disintegration from believing. Synthesizing conceptual frameworks are burdening the limitations of human thought, still yet being complicated enough to fully analyze. Even Hegel's bibliography has taken a massive part of giving an informational overview of the whole concept itself, yet still coveted by the unknowable. Centuries of philosophy have attempted to discover more aspects, and factors in play to flatten the hurdle Hegel made with his works, with no signs of success, everything is still overwhelmingly difficult to attain well-versed knowledge in.

The troubling concern that arises from this personal intellectual exercise is not merely the time spent, but the realization that such time has been consumed by the creation of elaborate chains of reasoning that appear, upon reflection, to be no more than a monstrosity of futile rubbishness which are words strung together in order to invalidate my initial standpoint regarding the existence of the celestial, yet offering nothing substantial beyond the illusion of profundity in a sense of delusion which one typical person have committed to have in pursuit for. I have sought, again and again, to challenge myself by fabricating counterpoints, to see the capabilities of actual scrutiny of whether it possesses such capability of overturning decisions, antitheses to my own

convictions, so as to deepen my understanding of the possibility if there might exist resources of thought, conceptual, or otherwise, that could validate the divine, or expose it as something as hollow as an essential form of human being to begin with. Yet even after vigorously subjecting my reflections to what I considered as a deliberate philosophical analysis with testing the boundaries of my embodiment of central consciousness, the extent of my knowledge, and the very possibility of knowing at all, I remain where I began, with no real significance drawn from the endeavor. This exercise, therefore, becomes its own antithesis: an implicit correction to my incongruences, a candid admission of the futility embedded in my attempts at intellectual provocation. What lingers is not certainty, but the residue of failure, an acknowledgment that in striving to dissect the concept of God through rational methodologies, I have paradoxically illuminated the insufficiency of rational methodologies themselves. It is not difficult for one who aspires to be open-minded to seek conflict with their own ideals; indeed, the practice is praised as noble, as a way of nurturing intellectual humility and cultivating deeper insights. But for me, the process of confronting my own arguments' flaws has not produced the anticipated nourishment of thought, but rather an exhaustion, a recognition that to distort and reshape one's views endlessly may generate more fragmentation than clarity. The dialectical model, wherein antithesis is reconciled with thesis to yield synthesis, holds an enticing promise of intellectual progress, yet in my case the supposed synthesis does not feel like a reconciliation at all. I am instead left with a deeper fragmentation, as though the tension between theism and atheism, when pressed to its limits, yields no synthesis but a perpetual deadlock. I question whether such synthesis is even possible, or whether we have already reached the limits of transcendental knowledge about this dilemma, or whether humanity has simply exhausted its capacity to produce new, untold ideas in this sphere, circling instead around the same irresolvable paradoxes. Perhaps the real tragedy is not in failing to arrive at an answer, but in recognizing that centuries of philosophical labor, with all its meticulous frameworks and rigorous systems, have done little more than push the horizon of the unknowable further away. Hegel, whose dialectical system sought to provide an architecture for resolving contradictions, looms heavily over this reflection: his bibliography alone is enough to overwhelm any individual thinker with the sheer audacity of attempting to map the logic of being and thought itself. Yet even his monumental synthesis has been interpreted, contested, reinterpreted, and challenged endlessly, such that the philosophical tradition following him reveals not the triumph of reason but its endless struggle against its own limitations. Generations of philosophers have tried to flatten the hurdle Hegel set forth, to render accessible the heights of his conceptual mountain, but each attempt seems only to confirm the impossibility of ever grasping the totality. And here, I too remain caught in the same labyrinth, carrying forward my own futile endeavor, compelled by the same desire to seek meaning, yet unable to arrive at anything more than the recognition of complexity itself. If there is a lesson, it is that the burden of synthesis may itself be too great for human thought, and that admitting to such a burden is not weakness but the only form of honesty left when confronted with the unknowable. And with admitting the plausibility of myself as close-minded, I find myself objectifying the sensibility of agnosticism. Where every mystery, and uncertainty is accepted, yet never too bothered to uncover the truths behind it for the fear of seeking unintentional catastrophic facts in

human knowledge, or the polarizing filter of it. Although every religious doctrine, and even atheism, are funnily flawed enough to make us wonder of how either uneducated we beings came to be, for pursuing self-subjectivity, or the depths behind our beliefs being incompatible with societal views, in justification of your own moral views influenced by these. By committing the thoughts of influencing moral integration towards futile perfection, have we managed ourselves to become the better critics of our own beliefs, undisclosed, and unrelated to the myths of mystical beings' existence? While the sensation of invigorating form of strategy concludes personal commitment due to unreliable sense of pleasure from it momentarily, proceed to cultivate the richness of one's delusions, onto another, until mass growth of certain worldview compacts all unsaid disagreements into the void of unthinking. We finally learn to captivate the weakness of our own mental superiorities, and turn each of us our own delusional puppets of truthfulness lacking validity in every aspect, yet we manage to breakthrough for brilliant attempts to do so.

# Questions for Conscious Certainty

## Question 1: Whether atheism is the solution for mental superiority

It doesn’t necessarily concern the mind regarding this particular matter of intellectual discourse, yet it requires certain conclusions, as we desire complete certainty in knowledge, and responses for unprecedented questions (partially referring to this part’s label.)

How do we ideally determine something as such? In this case, mental superiority? In my viewpoint, various factors are in play for this conception consisting of intellect, versatility, permeability, and adaptability. I will briefly connect these four factors with the atheistic viewpoint, synthesizing all conclusions into one whole idea. Primarily, atheism is a formal opposition to the belief of considering a deity to be consciously existent, whether constitutive to the elemental structure of everything. Is there an actual prime mover, designer, and generator? It's insignificant for it to be figured out, yet the thought of rejecting these ideas is promoting superiority without clarity of its accuracy. There aren't plenty of arguments rejecting divine intervention, and presence as it projects distinction between a shared idea of a whole, and a conflict by a few, being these arguments standing out for eternal perception until humanity vanishes. It can be both intellectually profound both believing, and not in a set of doctrine pertaining to God's existence, though they pursue different aspects of logical discourse, and consideration. They focus on various logical conclusions, depending on the justification of such. One instance favours teleological assumption through questioning regarding the complexity of our world, mind, and nature, being interconnected to a complex designer, whilst the other focused on empirical sensibility, and dependency on its function, believing no certain circumstance without any effect on the empirical senses of one.

There's something considered to be a spiritual truth to all, of which suggests intensiveness of its subjection. How can something like that be reliable for heavy belief, and cultivation? It isn't, and that is the problem. As for any fact (not a truth) requires immense verification, and supporting evidence for its veracity, and timeless deliberation of the degree of capability for profundity. Forcing one's ideal, even with all regard to the unreliability, is something dogmatic which is unideal to the practical sensibility of someone. How must one be capable of seeking absolute truth, by rejecting other antithetical truths to it? It is necessary to incorporate dialectics in all cases of finding better conclusive truths regarding a subject. It provides opportunity to one subject for thorough scrutiny until fully comprehended, which is the main goal of finding absolute facts. Assuming this problem only doesn't apply to being theistic, but to atheistic views as well. Although the dogmatic competency of atheism is heavily advantageous due to the reliance of extensive examination in natural knowledge continuously acquiring newer significant knowledge, simply science. This reliance I must say is fascinatingly strategic, and quite more intelligent than reliance on ancient texts without epistemological significance whatsoever. I still must not conclude that either is superior, or inferior to the other.

In time of still uncertainty is an indication for every knowledge to be also doubted, scrutinized, and not fully relied on. With this applying to knowledge, must especially be more considered in beliefs, for it integrates faith, and spiritual endeavors, just as it should be considered on scientific claims/findings. In periods characterized by prevailing uncertainty, the stability of all purported knowledge is inevitably called into question. Beliefs, in particular as being grounded in faith, and often exempt from empirical substantiation, warrant even more rigorous intellectual scrutiny. The act of accepting any claim without thorough deliberation signifies a departure from reasoned discernment. Scientific conclusions, despite their methodological foundations, are themselves contingent and mutable. Therefore, uncertainty should not be feared but embraced as a necessary condition for deeper inquiry and disciplined skepticism.

Intellectual capability, as a principal attribute of mental superiority, encompasses the capacities for analysis, synthesis, abstraction, and logical coherence. Within frameworks of belief, non-belief, and suspended commitment, it manifests divergently particularly one side privileging empirical rigor and systematic clarity, another integrating rationality within metaphysical or moral structures, and a third maintaining an engaged yet inconclusive posture toward existential claims. Despite its foundational role, intellect possesses limitations that constrain its utility when unaccompanied by other faculties. It tends toward over-systematization, risks detachment from qualitative realities, and may foster an unwarranted confidence in its own constructions. Its pursuit of definitive resolution can prematurely foreclose necessary ambiguity, reducing the richness of experience to narrow analytic forms. Moreover, it often dismisses epistemologies not immediately translatable into logical schemes, thereby restricting its own adaptability. Language itself, the tool through which intellect functions, can entrap thought within self-referential loops, further exacerbating these limitations. Consequently, intellect, while indispensable, cannot singularly determine mental superiority without risking epistemic rigidity or abstraction unmoored from reality.

Versatility, as an aspect of mental superiority, is the mind's ability to adapt and operate across different contexts, disciplines, and frameworks without losing coherence. It involves not just accumulating knowledge but the skill to shift between varying approaches and modes of thought. For those grounded in belief, versatility shows itself in openness to diverse interpretations and the ability to navigate complex ideas. In contrast, the committed atheist might show rigid adherence to a singular rational framework, while the devout believer may resist engaging with alternative viewpoints. However, a mind that avoids definitive commitment often demonstrates greater adaptability, able to entertain contradictions and uncertainties without being confined by them. Yet, versatility carries disadvantages. An overly adaptable mind may struggle to develop deep expertise, moving too quickly between concepts without thoroughly mastering any. Its openness may lead to a lack of firm principles, causing intellectual instability. Versatility can also lead to relativism, where all perspectives are viewed as equally valid regardless of their truth value. This can obscure the ability to critically evaluate competing ideas, resulting in a tolerance that collapses into intellectual indifference. Furthermore, versatility without direction risks the dispersion of focus, preventing the establishment of meaningful conclusions or stable frameworks.

While it enhances adaptability and intellectual breadth, it can undermine the capacity for depth and critical judgment if not carefully regulated.

The mind that absorbs contradiction without collapse, that invites challenge without fear of distortion, and that receives opposing frameworks without surrendering to them, demonstrates a rare cognitive sophistication. This trait, often observed in those who neither cling to a single metaphysical account nor reject them all outright, reveals an active permeability, a structured receptivity rather than naïve openness. It is the ability to entertain the foreign, the dissonant, the unsettling, not to dissolve the self but to sharpen its boundaries through selective incorporation. Where the dogmatic rationalist resists deviation and the devout adherent shields belief from interference, the permeable mind allows friction, lets opposing currents pass through, tests its own convictions against what lies beyond them. It neither absorbs blindly nor rejects reflexively, but filters, contrasts, compares. The advantage lies in a more resilient intellectual structure, one that survives ideological shifts and grows stronger through them. The danger lies in the absence of filtration, where permeability degenerates into indecision, where everything enters, nothing is weighed, and all positions are flattened into equivalence. Without an inner system of evaluation, the mind risks becoming a vessel for contradiction, not as a deliberate dialectic but as confusion disguised as openness. Permeability becomes a strength only when it is coupled with critical distinction, when the mind maintains an axis of judgment amidst continual exposure to competing claims. When neglected, it can yield a kind of passive pluralism, where understanding becomes incoherent accumulation rather than integrated insight.

Adaptability isn’t about just bending when the world around you shifts, it’s about knowing when to twist, when to turn, and when to stand firm. The mind that adapts doesn’t just respond; it reconfigures, evolving its ways of thinking to match the ever-changing terrain. It’s not about scrambling to catch up with the moment, but about using that very moment to redefine your approach. When faced with new ideas, conflicting perspectives, or a challenging environment, adaptability allows the mind to navigate without clinging to rigidity. It’s not about holding onto one belief or framework, but having the capacity to adjust the mental compass without losing direction. This is what sets the adaptable apart: they don’t just stick to what they know, they find ways to make the unfamiliar work. It’s a powerful tool, but one that can slip into recklessness if not wielded carefully. Adaptability can turn into an excuse for inconsistency, constantly shifting direction without ever truly committing. Without a firm foundation, it can lead to a kind of perpetual movement, never arriving anywhere concrete. The adaptable mind can become too fluid, stretching itself thin across too many paths, unable to form a solid conviction. It’s a balancing act as for too much flexibility, and you lose your center, too little and you’re trapped in an echo chamber of outdated beliefs. True adaptability requires both resilience and discernment, the wisdom to change when change is needed and the discipline to know when not to. Without that balance, adaptability risks becoming an endless reshuffling, more movement than progress.

What is the belief in disbelief lacking conclusiveness in one's existential knowledge is superior to any kind of belief system regardless of how evident these beliefs will be

considered. Doubt, and the acknowledgement for uncertainty is powerful in terms of the absolute.

## Question 2: Whether seeking God is impractical

The seeking of the unknowably uncertain is a constant, yet also stagnant methodology of human purpose, and significance behind, and the heights it implies.

Such an idea hinges on the belief in a deity, or deities which isn't grounded in empirical evidence, nor psychological sensibility, and thus cannot provide either tangible/intangible, practical benefits in the same methodology science, and proper reason can. It is widely argued that theism mostly relies on pure faith, which we perceive as incompatible with the empirical approaches that drive technological, and scientific progress into transcendence. From this collective perspective, it can be said that the practicality of theism must be highly questioned due to it being perceived to be based on faithful unverifiable claims, and dogma rather than observable reality in accordance with scientific methods.

Although, for plenty of theists, the practical benefits of their faith solely rely on the depth of their personal, and spiritual connections to the belief (of which can be considered psychologically pleasing, yet still impractical), which are made significant vastly because of religion encompassing a sense of definitive purpose, moral guidance, and emotional resilience. These benefits aren't necessarily, nor absolutely measurable by human empirical standards (of which this essay heavily considers, and favours) but are profoundly impactful in the lives of believers themselves which serves conclusively eventuating significance in humanity. Theism seems to provide a certain framework for understanding the nature of the world, coping with endless suffering, and finding unified community, and comfort from belonging. While theism may not offer the kind of practicality in aspects favouring the empirical approaches that comes from objective scientific innovation, and discovery, it fulfills other sensibly pleasing human needs that are equally vital (by their perception). Whether theism is perceived as either practical, or impractical largely depends on how one defines the essence of "practicality", and what one values in their whole spiritual worldview.

Faith is the main problem of this large conflicting ideology. By then positioned as the principal instrument of seeking truth, renders discourse inert, and decision-making irrational. It does not persuade through objective reason, evidence, or actual logic, but demands surrender to the unproven, and believes in the uncertain. The very act of believing without the consideration of reliance on seeing is treated as a moral virtue, and thus, skepticism is arguably the foundation of actual human progress rather than faith itself, of which is condemned. The theistic dogma, by holding faith as a supreme act, inadvertently sanctions conflict; belief systems that cannot be proven cannot be reconciled, and without the ability to test, or falsify unjustifiable claims, disagreements become intellectually eternal. When people assert opposing truths with equal fervor, and no means of verification, resolution through peaceful deliberation is impossible for such, how much more for seeking certainty. In this sense, it is not just an epistemic failure, it is a tangible practical hazard. History provides no shortage of evidence for

provable circumstances, and conceptions: religious, and national wars, inquisitions, persecutions, and holy crusades, scientific disturbances, abnormal mutations, and cosmological discoveries, all born from reasoned disagreement, synthesizing senseful discourses, with also from mutually exclusive certainties, sealed by the sanctity of irrational faith. Ideologies built on faith are not only impervious to correction, being also incentivized to remain so. To question being is to betray the sacredness, for also to doubt is to sin. There's an absence of mechanism within faith-based systems to allow for ascendant growth that is not simultaneously a risk to rigorous orthodoxy.

The collective viewpoint as a structure reliant on faith, inherently resists transcendental practicality of the conscious mind. One of which doesn't prioritize pleasing outcomes, constant efficiency, or valued consequences, to align decisions with divine prescriptions of personal accounts. In matters of policy, science, medicine, and civil rights, this becomes not only significantly obstructive but dangerous as well. When theists somehow, somewhat oppose life-saving medical procedures requiring precision to the eccentric, and mundane, restrict educational contentment without dogmatic outlines of religion, or legislate based on ancient scripture rather than generational consensus, they do so with impunity, protected by the sanctified untouchability of the presence of faith. What is divinely ordained cannot be debated, such as what the holy is to never be petrified by conflictions. It turns into a shield for laughable irrationality. Insofar of such, theological doctrines, even with it being internally coherent within their own mythic structures, fail to deliver usable morals (although it is revolutionary for humanity to propose moral compasses within religion), or empirical insights in pluralistic societies. Too insulated, too abstract, too dependent on metaphysical assumptions (just as much as my own, of which I wholly disdain.)

## Question 3: Whether Transcendental progress functions in a Godless world

Difficulty of achieving what I call the "Transcendental Progress" is as difficult as creating barbaric concepts for the triviality of unexplainable presumptions, or consequential events we've not known any of. Yet humankind perfected the art of doing the latter, and becoming the epitomic nature of every disadvantageous aspect of the consequences it provides. Lack of motivation for cohesion, inconsequentiality behind pursuit, and the will of radical perfection.

In the statement of such, to attempt to frame transcendental progress as an attainable path is to fall into the trap of confusing the direction of thought with the object of realization. Human cognition, despite its capacity for abstraction and the construction of ideals, remains tethered to conditions that prevent it from ever stepping outside itself. This boundary is not merely practical, such as the inability to fully map the universe or to calculate every hidden mechanism of existence; it is epistemological at its core, a limitation built into the very structure of knowing. What is most revealing about the concept of transcendental progress is that it highlights this contradiction with unusual clarity: the more one pursues it as if it were a definitive endpoint, the more one exposes the futility of that pursuit. Yet this does not make it irrelevant, nor does it reduce it to the status of a fantasy. Rather, it shows that progress, in this transcendental sense, exists

as an orientation, a movement toward a horizon that constantly withdraws, rather than as an arrival at a stable destination. The inadequacy of linking this horizon to the divine underscores the difficulty of projecting human categories onto what surpasses them. Invoking God may appear to give transcendental progress a foundation, but in reality, it only substitutes one mystery for another, exchanging epistemological impossibility for metaphysical decree without bridging the gap between them. To move beyond this conflation requires seeing transcendental progress not as an assurance granted by an external power but as an internal provocation, a reminder of the insufficiency of any claim to finality. It’s worth lies not in the promise of completion but in the tension, it creates within thought itself, compelling the mind to expand while never allowing it to escape its boundaries. This creates a peculiar duality: transcendental progress humbles by exposing the smallness of human capacity, yet it elevates by refusing to let that capacity remain dormant. The impossibility becomes a kind of necessity, for without it, the human search for meaning would risk collapsing into complacency, satisfied with provisional answers and shallow coherence. In this way, transcendental progress reveals itself not as a doctrine of attainment but as an ethic of incompleteness, a demand that one remains open to what cannot be fully known. Such a demand resists both the dogmatic certainties of theological systems and the reductionist closures of purely material reasoning, situating itself instead in the restless middle ground where human beings must wrestle with their own inadequacies without expecting deliverance from them. That wrestling, with all its frustrations, illuminates the very condition of humanity, showing that to exist is to be perpetually drawn toward what exceeds comprehension. I simply dictate the path of transcendental progress to be the option against the myriad amount of pursuit towards the latter consideration. I have figured the inconsistencies with my attempts to correlate the concept to the presence of a divine. Yet what I have missed is the purity of being the whole idea to oppose the latter. The judgment for transcendental progress does not rely on the metaphysical impossibilities of a God's judgment itself, but is merely in a field narrowed down as the certain "unachievable" among it. It's an epistemological impossibility, just as it is, simply existing in an already complicated world unprepared to unveil the nature of transcendental progress yet, which may never happen in the age of humankind.

As already discussed thoroughly in the previous chapters of Metaphysical Discourses, we're incapable of functioning, and making use of transcendental progress as a beneficial merit to our own well-being. As a grand pedestal to seeking perfection lies ahead the keys to open the certainty for reaching transcendental progress, and that takes no human-like features, but another unfound nature of capability, concealed due to the incompatibility of such absurdness to humanity. It does not require any dine, nor profoundness of a flawed objection to subjectivity, but a reliance on what is unavailable to be generated in the aspects of human nature.

## Question 4: Why I initially constructed an oppositional discourse

Trials of failure to condemn the truth in search of unveiling it procured ambiguity in a form of comfort to being unsure of every elemental value conceptually gratifying one's identity, and personal views. Failure in confronting truth became a repetitive exercise, masked as progress. Each attempt to uncover clarity fostered deeper ambiguity, not by

chance but by a quiet leaning toward the familiar space between knowing and not knowing. Assertions rose out of uncertainty, shaped more by internal preference than by external reality. The pursuit circled itself, not in direction of resolution, but toward a state of tolerable uncertainty. Truth, once near, lost its form. Its presence interrupted comfort. Discomfort rejected it. The unfamiliar provoked silence. Evasion dressed itself in complexity. The unknown, renamed as unreachable, received quiet acceptance. Truth stood still. Failure wore the appearance of motion. The pattern continued. Ambiguity evolved into utility. Not as confusion, but as a shelter from the consequence of definition. Being unsure became identity. The question became performance. To answer, unnecessary. Every elemental value filtered through personal satisfaction, not coherence. Meaning adjusted to accommodate the self. Belief stabilized perception, not reality. A person aligned with ideas that reflected their shape. What conflicted, dissolved. Uncertainty gave flexibility. In that space, one could remain intact, untouched by contradiction. The truth, reduced to impression. The view, more important than the view's accuracy. The inquiry remained, but shallow. The search persisted, but safely. The truth, withheld by choice, became invisible.

My resistance from so-called "objective truth" to comply into a permeable worldview, dissecting contributions of human thought aiming sheer coherence, and newly-adapted knowledge in accordance to stratification of rational dogma. Coveted in a sense of dullness within, procures the ecstatically incoherent pleasure of discoursing about unknowable natures. What lies beneath all "truth" is a sustainable pursuit of lies, and deceitful rages of contentment from wondering practicality, or desirable conclusions. How exactly *Leap of Faith* is effective in terms of survivability of one's ideals, and rational expressions, uncovers flawed arguments of certainty (although it recesses the importance of such) by investing all into mere unaccountable pursuit. Leap of faith functions not as escape but as mechanism. Not a solution, not a surrender. A silent transference of weight from the unbearable to the unseen. It carries no blueprint, offers no calculations. Yet it moves thought across terrain logic cannot name. In moments where reason fragments into paralysis, faith stitches continuity. Not by design, but by compulsion. Not clarity, but momentum. Beliefs float, not anchored by evidence but held aloft by necessity. It is not the answer, it is the act of refusing to collapse in the absence of one. To leap is not to fly. It is to fall with intent. Rational structures bend beneath accumulated doubt, where the giant leap absorbs this, converts it into an energy forming rationales. The argument weakens under infinite precision as the faith resists by avoiding precision altogether. It cannot be disproven because it never participates in that contest. It lives outside. There, it becomes livable. Certainty fades, coherence dissolves, yet the self remains intact, even affirmed. The leap is not survival through truth, but survival through commitment to continue without it. The unmeasurable becomes the foundation. Metaphor replaces metric. The unknowable becomes not a problem but a partner.

## Question 5: How the Bible is an unreliable literature

There is some genuine fascination I've felt towards the purposive existence of Abrahamic religions, particularly Christianity. That is the creation of the bible, and the ideas it portrayed redundantly for a milestone of more than 700,000 words. It is

compact, distinguished for the aim of expansive spread of words of God as they claim it to be. But why avoid integrating the word of God, and the behavior of all people involved this literature preserves to glorify? Other than the intellectual fascination we found investigating ancient writings of tons of parables about a deity, we seem to have taken advantage of this brilliant collection of ideas, and stories to be the benchmark of human decency, and ethical principles to be pursued. That idea alone is completely indifferent to every catastrophe humanity experience. The impact of purity of heart, between the belief of glorious certainty as a conclusion of something sacred, comprises an ever-ending sense of confidence at deciding whether what must be done.

It can be called the "sacred manual book for the ignorant", I see it to be as accurate as that label. It contracts all the enormous babbling into one aspect of its purpose, and that is the teacher. Who could be taught are those who have no knowledge about what the words are trying to imply, and that serves its purpose to those clueless about it, but those individuals themselves saw another aspect of its purpose, which made the book serve more purpose to other things (and by saying purpose, I don't necessarily mean advantageous ones). What's common in reading literature is the inevitability of misinterpreting the text onto something profound even just by a saying of the text being "I watched the sunset over the blue curtains of my room", the reader misalign the definition of the words implied onto another idea that isn't completely correlated to the original intent of the author, and thus creates another set of belief of it, not just a simple immersion to the artistry behind, but the sense of pursuing the path of it, becoming consequential. The peculiarity of this phenomenon is that the Bible, while proclaimed as an authentic piece of divine revelation solely towards the consideration for human comprehension, is currently still processed through the inevitable limitation of human interpretation for reasons unknown of God's intent to be interpretable. That particular limitation however, whether intellectual or emotional, becomes the sanctuary by which the purely sacred transforms into something else entirely, consisting of personal conviction, and vindication, institutional doctrine for channeling human coordination for identical worldviews, or even worse—political weaponry for the objectivity of nature. Once the text escapes the grasp of its own intended purity for humanity, it ceases to be just a collection of words, from human intellect, forgotten wonders, and endless possibilities of fictional discourse. Merely it evolves into a tool for conceptualization of superiority, and ascendancy of integrity, at times can be benevolent, at times upon permitted destructiveness, depending on the hands that wield it, or the stories of convey to mirror the subjection of situational attribution. For what was intended as guidance becomes a natural judgment of personal legislation towards the majority, and what was once a collective creativity of entertaining, yet repetitive spiritual narrative becomes an unyielding code of central authority to all, stripping away the complete subtlety in favor of a rigid order. This complex dynamic reveal that the literary text itself is not the origin of consequential occurrences, most notably the interpretation instead, as well as the obsession to construct absolute meaning where ambiguity originally thrived, behind the discourse of face-value narrative. With the particular notion of insistence on reading the Bible as an exhaustive, and source of objective truth rather than a historical, or allegorical literary artifact introduces a series of coherence, and logical paradoxes. It asks humanity to embrace the eternal while being bound to the temporality of culture, language, and shifting moral frameworks, as if it does not constitute the entire

contradictory factors of eternity, and infiniteness itself. In the constant passing of generations, newer hermeneutic contexts reshape the lens of interpretation, yet the claim of permanence remains untouched. The tragedy lies in this unspoken contradiction: a timeless book caught in the hands of a time-dependent reader. Its stories, parables, and moral dictates may once have been fresh, even radical, but the moment they were fossilized into canon, their flexibility became constrained. The sacred, in this sense, is not immune to decay—it simply decays more slowly, cloaked in the aura of divinity.

Therefore, this specific collective fascination does not lie solely in the Bible's content, but in its capacity to continuously breed reinterpretation, to exemplify endless cycles of belief that branch out far beyond the intent of its initial authors, or compilers. Each new hermeneutical misinterpretation due to misreading, each new layer of personal projected meaning to solidify the essence of one's subjection, reinforces its status not as a divine artifact for its inferiority, and flawed material, well given as a reflection of such which reflects the personal fears, hopes, and ambitions of those who approach it as some sort of connectivity to themselves. And what configures in that reflection, one may discover that what is often mistaken for the "word of God" is, in various truths, the amplified voicing out of intellectual discourses of humanity itself, compacted as a form of sacred language so as to disguise its origin which is not to be dealt with by absolution of certainty, of whether it divides the thought of underlying religious viewpoints, or narrating events that seem to be the largest, and most exhaustive book of manual to live in a soulless, meaningless world, wherein fantastical liberations have grown out to dispose itself into something as such, without the justification of the possibilities to the perception of those who perceives it as a practical use of pursuit towards living without discontentment.

# Creating the Concept of Gods

There's a collective idea of humanity regarding our indubitable capabilities to ascend simple discourse towards something more profound than it should be. Just as such, we're capable of escaping realities by creating our own portals into acceptable realities instead, evading mental difficulties by creating substantial glorification of illusion, without the concentration for actual significance behind factuality. There isn't truly a deeper definition, nor purpose for the creation of unexplainable conception, as it is simply out of casual acceptance of humans to the limitations of their capabilities for acquiring knowledge, and ascendency. With this acceptance becomes a mere comfort of disdain, and frustration from grievances by reason of these limitations, it forms some sort of perceivable discontentment of the possible, and aspiration of otherwise. How come we seem to always be discontent of everything even with its own abundance? This question's certain response is the fuel against a stigma of unknown, withholding the insignificance of provision without precise purposiveness within itself, of which humans are tasked to discover until forming a collective idea full of speculative discourse satisfactory to the senses molding intellectual impressions, and the depths of it.

The unforgiving nature of humanity to the catastrophe of itself for being unintentionally ignorant causes imperceptible conceptions to provide "answers" to unsolved wonders it also produces, or potentially ignores for good. In the persistent pursuit of comprehension, human nature demonstrates a tendency to construct frameworks of explanation that are neither complete nor necessarily accurate, but instead sufficient for temporary cognitive satisfaction. This satisfaction arises not from a grounded understanding, but from the alleviation of discomfort brought by uncertainty. The mind, when faced with phenomena that challenge its assumptions or capacities, frequently defaults to speculative constructions rather than rigorous inquiry. These constructions, though often masked as knowledge, serve more as placeholders for meaning than as definitive resolutions. It becomes evident that humanity, acting under limited self-awareness, generates crises not always through intention, but through the unacknowledged consequences of its decisions and omissions. Ignorance, in this context, is not always an active denial but a passive byproduct of unchecked belief systems and premature conclusions. As such, many of the intellectual and existential dilemmas that persist are both the result of and response to humanity’s incomplete grasp of itself and its environment.

Foundational concepts emerge from this cycle. Born not purely from empirical observation, but often from necessity. They attempt to explain what remains elusive, assigning value or narrative to that which resists categorization. In this process, the original question is sometimes displaced by the urgency to resolve it, even if resolution is simulated rather than achieved. What follows is the normalization of interpretative mechanisms that lack foundational clarity. These mechanisms become embedded in culture, education, and discourse, often unchallenged, thereby replicating and legitimizing ambiguity under the guise of insight. The human response to complexity often involves simplification, and in doing so, there is a frequent abandonment of that which cannot be immediately understood or applied. This abandonment does not signify

irrelevance of the subject, but rather an implicit prioritization of comfort over confrontation. It is not uncommon for profound uncertainties to be overlooked indefinitely, not because they have been solved, but because continued engagement with them yields no convenient conclusion. Institutional systems, whether intellectual, ideological, or societal, frequently reinforce these patterns by rewarding coherence, even if that coherence is artificially constructed. The result is a collective narrative that may exclude unresolved or inconvenient inquiries in favor of a more manageable worldview. In such a context, many unresolved phenomena are categorized not as unknowns, but as non-essentials, thereby placing them outside the sphere of active consideration. Ultimately, the dynamics of human cognition and social structure contribute to a persistent loop in which explanations are pursued not solely to illuminate, but to pacify. The cost of this loop is not always visible but manifests over time as a subtle but significant erosion of critical inquiry. And while this condition is not inherently malicious, it remains problematic, as it shapes the parameters of knowledge in ways that prioritize resolution over truth. The difficulty in confronting this preference for coherence projects itself in how deeply it is woven into nearly every institution we rely on to shape knowledge and social order. Whether in academia, religion, government, or cultural traditions, there is a clear tendency to embrace a neatly finished narrative, often at the expense of raw, unresolved complexity. Ambiguity, when admitted openly, threatens the stability of the frameworks upon which these systems rest, and so it is rarely welcomed. As a result, coherence is elevated into something more than a standard; it becomes a requirement, a silent condition for legitimacy. Within this climate, the unresolved is pushed to the margins, or else it is reshaped into a version simple enough to fit within established boundaries. But that simplicity comes with a cost: the refusal to acknowledge what cannot be easily explained prevents us from engaging fully with reality in its depth and richness. Institutions then perpetuate a cycle of intellectual conservatism, offering the illusion of stability rather than the reality of progress. The coherence that is rewarded is often not the kind that leads us closer to truth, but the kind that preserves authority, consensus, or continuity. Such coherence is fragile, because it relies on silencing dissonant voices and ignoring unsolvable questions that inevitably arise. Over time, this creates a cultural atmosphere where individuals internalize the message that questioning beyond the accepted frame is not only unhelpful, but dangerous. What begins as a quiet discouragement of inquiry slowly hardens into outright resistance to uncertainty, training entire generations to see doubt as weakness and inconsistency as failure, rather than as a necessary reflection of the limits of human understanding. In this way, the preference for coherence distorts the natural rhythm of intellectual exploration, where open questions should be embraced as signs of vitality rather than suppressed as signs of inadequacy.

Yet as much as the persistence of this pattern also speaks to a deeper psychological tendency that reaches beyond institutional structures and into the core of human thought. People cling to coherent narratives not only because authority demands it, but because such narratives offer orientation in the midst of overwhelming complexity. To dwell endlessly in uncertainty is exhausting, for it strips away the comfort of closure and the reassurance of explanation. In this sense, the drive toward coherence performs an important existential function, even if it often does so at the expense of honesty. The

real danger emerges when this adaptive instinct ossifies into habit, and habit is reinforced by institutions until it becomes dogma that resists all correction. Coherence, once a useful tool for navigating reality, is mistaken for an end in itself, with stability confused for truth and consensus confused for understanding. This explains why entire societies cling to stories that are outdated or even demonstrably false, and why dissenting voices, no matter how reasonable, struggle to break through. The cycle repeats because it satisfies both our desire for psychological comfort and the needs of institutional order, together forming a barrier that resists genuine critical inquiry. Over time, this produces intellectual stagnation, where innovation is choked and curiosity redirected toward defending what is already accepted rather than probing what remains unknown. The price is not abstract but painfully real: the erosion of our capacity to confront uncertainty with honesty and courage. By elevating resolution above truth, we end up with a world that is more orderly in appearance but less accurate in substance, a world where our explanations do not illuminate reality but soothe us against it.

Human understanding, no matter how advanced it becomes, is always shadowed by the vastness of what we do not and perhaps cannot know. Our sciences, philosophies, and traditions offer fragments of clarity, yet each discovery tends to reveal a greater horizon of mystery that outpace comprehension. Even when knowledge expands, it expands into a field that is infinitely larger than our grasp, reminding us that our certainty is provisional at best. This recognition does not diminish the value of inquiry but places it within a humbler frame, one where progress is measured not by final answers but by the depth and honesty of the questions we dare to ask. We're naturally ignorant as humans, because we aim to discover even the most incapable of discovering, then offer the bound it serves, yielding the act of wondering forevermore. And by being naturally ignorant, produces discourses of profoundness, by the illusion of discovering, it seeks validation to consider what "profound" is. Insofar as humans cultivate the innovation of any form of validated knowledge. This can be also told on the account of my theory in my response to Question 5 of the precious chapter. We serve things more than they are implicated their purposes to, and by it, conducts a sense of validation for the mental gymnasts who have thought these things till success. We work for our own necessity to relieve our constant mental distress towards a path astray from achievable circumstances led by resilience, and felt with hardships, and prolonged endurance

# EXISTENTIAL DISCOURSES

# III

# Necessity of seeking purposes for one's existence in a relentless world

# What the ideal nature of living can be

Would it make sense to provide violence to enjoy living? What is the "ideal" and the "unideal" prospects of living freely? Do the human standards of determining these contribute highly to the objective nature of wellness? Can there be something which assures pure meaning to live further in a sense without faith of the unknown, and uncertainty of beings despite being either substantial, or otherwise? In spite of all seriousness of living, and the depths behind going further, constitutes grave occurrences to question certainty itself, and by such we're baffled due to prolonged isolation from these kinds of questioning, dogmatically refusing to have an open mind to communicate about human reason. Being foolish comes as a person morally worse than an evil one, for they apply unconventional ideals, and act whilst surpassing the grasp of moral compasses, and additionally holding into unawareness of such.

I must not dive into a more extensive ethical discourse, although that was a related note for the matter, and will be involved inevitably.

Presuming life is a sanctuary of meaninglessness, or on the contrary, is a jar of uncertainty. Is there no need to question the point of pursuing it? Is suicide actually a sinful act (in a perspective of a theist) when done, condemning the pursuer in the depths of additional suffering by escaping it from a realistic aspect of living. There can be a justification for suicide as like in every other concept of action. But what truly serves suicide to someone's life? It seemed very catastrophic, from the deteriorating ideal of a degrading individual, in perception of reactionary judgment, or may induce shock for those who never fathomed the heights of one's own act to pursue it. Yet it still fails to entice me into believing it's morally bad. In unconventional implications set to impress the societal worldview in collective disagreements violently stay confronted by the inaccurate criticisms of such, as it does not only disclose further scrutiny, but concludes even the uncertainty of their judgments. The purpose of any individual material, even the glorified consciously functioning ones, also may never be a conclusion to pin-pointing one's personal definition, but rather in a form of humanistic subjective identity determined by the strong sense of identifying themselves in aspects of wellness of well-being, reconstruction of their own morals, and values as a living being. But no further requirement is sufficient to proceed with living in agony, or even at least with the consideration of overcoming ordeals dealt with pure reasonable purpose. It holds no value for the conceptual progress, nor the transcendental progress of the world, as it.

## Metaphysical aspects of the importance of Suicide

Where the fear lies within the purpose of doing such a malicious act against life is already a misconception in itself, the fear for the unknown of living horrifies more to the person. In development, committing the unbearable also fears the thoughts of those who do not personally perceive, exposes the same amount of fear, of which is completely unnecessary, as any other fears there exist. The relentless pursuit to

discomfort the circumstance to a person who perceives suicide as a moral objection to the unforgivable is unjustness of the freedom for such, inasmuch as to restrict their moral responsibilities to learn the fundamental truths to their world, of which is never identical to another being. Although there is a massive objectivity with the fundamental truth of justifying suicide, and as to how it should be justified at all. The world in subjectivity is correct in terms of its capabilities to be perceived, and experienced, as to any empirical sense is a lot more subjective, due to the effect of the subjectivity of the former matter (thus the reality we perceive, serving the same factor for the latter.) Existence becomes the center of a contemplation that defies the conventional meaning of endurance, for in the reflection of human consciousness, the act of continuing becomes an obligation imposed rather than an intention chosen, the difference between these two reveals the conflict of understanding the essence of living. The notion of life being sacred is only an interpretation held by the consensus of morality, yet the sacredness itself depends upon the eyes that view it, for no principle of life carries a universal justification beyond the interpretation of the perceiver. When a person is bound by the fear of ceasing to exist, it is not death that terrifies but the loss of perception, as perception itself gives value to being. What one fears, therefore, is not annihilation, but the deprivation of meaning, for existence without meaning cannot survive beyond the body that sustains it. The same fear nurtures an illusion of necessity, convincing one that to live is an intrinsic duty owed to something beyond comprehension, perhaps to an idea of purpose formed by others rather than oneself, an obligation inherited rather than realized. Within this structure of imposed continuance, the mind grows dissonant, unable to reconcile between the instinct to persist and the awareness of futility, and in such dissonance lies the quiet rebellion of the spirit that seeks resolution in the act of ending. The moral constraint against such rebellion becomes not a guidance toward goodness, but a resistance to individual realization, a refusal to acknowledge that autonomy of existence extends also to autonomy of cessation. To deny the right of withdrawal from being is to assert ownership over another's consciousness, to place boundaries around what should remain undefined by any will but the self. The justification for moral objection emerges often from the fear of confronting that existence might not be necessary at all, that perhaps the very continuity of life is a mere consequence of habit rather than a pursuit of genuine fulfillment. The collective perception of existence forms the illusion of continuity as virtue, sustaining the belief that pain is essential for understanding, and that endurance, no matter how unbearable, defines the worth of being alive. Yet endurance detached from meaning dissolves into repetition, becoming a performance of survival rather than an expression of life, and therein the distinction fades between living and merely existing. The justification that life holds absolute value for all beings collapses once one acknowledges that meaning is not transferable, for what sustains one's will may diminish another's, and what fulfills the sense of one may destroy the essence of another. The fear toward those who question this absolute originates not from their act, but from the reflection they impose on those who remain, for to witness one's rejection of existence is to face the fragility of one's own reason for staying. It disrupts the comfort of certainty, revealing that morality may serve preservation rather than understanding, and that

fear may disguise itself as virtue. The conflict between moral objection and existential autonomy therefore becomes the silent battlefield of the human condition, where one's desire for meaning confronts the collective insistence upon survival. The metaphysical inquiry into this state does not demand resolution, for the essence of being cannot be measured through judgment but only through perception, which alters endlessly as the consciousness evolves. Existence, viewed from its most personal horizon, becomes not a universal truth but a sequence of impressions, an ongoing manifestation of thoughts that either strengthen or dissolve one's attachment to reality. The justification of life, in this manner, becomes a decision rather than a fact, and the continuation of it an act of faith rather than an obligation. To exist, then, is not to affirm life as inherently worthy, but to create worth where none was found, to define purpose where there was only emptiness, to breathe meaning into a void that neither welcomes nor rejects. The acceptance of this responsibility becomes the ultimate expression of freedom, for it liberates one from the compulsion to justify one's presence to others, it allows existence to become a self-contained affirmation rather than a compliance to expectation. The act of understanding one's existence surpasses the concept of morality, for morality seeks to regulate what existence itself refuses to be confined by. In such reflection, the mind ceases to view life and death as opposites, and instead perceives them as continuations of the same essence that neither begins nor ends, but transforms within the consciousness that beholds it.

There isn't much of a sin with having multiple wives in a few religions, with it being forbidden in other religions. Where one right could be 10 wrongs, and vice versa. With subject to suicide, it is often generally overlooked as mentally dangerous, and catastrophic even for only one, or a few individuals. This conveys the thought experiment for others who may desire to do it, or those who justifies it (in which case I'm both.) In constructing the whole points of this essay, does not only seek to encourage the human capabilities of others to consider suicide as a practical solution, but to further objectify it as a staple for a human mind to consider sometime in their life. And it is constantly difficult to develop the applicable exposition with my position on the idea. As to other philosophies, some are inapplicable to be personally integrated, although every idea is of equal value to the others. The types of these philosophies sort out the philosophical range of a person in their subjective existence guided with empirical senses. As with experiences honed the perception of one. The absurdness of this philosophical view is as absurd as others in another set of human perceptions as well, not in the same manner of judgment, yet that itself is a myth within human reason of how the concept of equality necessarily functions. The equality of thought does not rest upon the sameness of beliefs, but upon the recognition that all beliefs, regardless of their contradiction, emerge from the same foundation of inquiry that defines human nature, for to think differently is not to err but to exist in another form of understanding. The contrast between moral justification and subjective reasoning reveals that rightness and wrongness are constructions drawn from cultural preservation, not from inherent truths. The boundaries that define what is sacred and what is forbidden shift according to the collective necessity of maintaining order, and thus what one faith condemns, another sanctifies. This duality illustrates the

frailty of moral permanence, exposing that morality is not a measure of truth but a manifestation of preference. The question of whether an act, such as the cessation of life, is virtuous or condemnable, depends not upon universal law, but upon who dictates the value of being. When an individual contemplates the justification of self-destruction, it is not merely an act of despair, but an inquiry into the legitimacy of existence as governed by others. To reject the obligation to live is to challenge the authority that determines what constitutes meaning, and this challenge unsettles the structure of belief that upholds the illusion of moral certainty. The discomfort society feels toward those who contemplate the end arises not from concern for the individual, but from fear that their own convictions may dissolve when confronted by such defiance. The concept of equality within philosophy fails once judgment intervenes, for the moment one thought is deemed superior, the essence of equality collapses, leaving only hierarchy disguised as order. The absurdity of life, therefore, is not in the realization that it lacks meaning, but in the insistence that meaning must be found through conformity. Each philosophy serves as a reflection of its creator's limitations, a mirror to their perception of truth shaped by time, experience, and circumstance. To regard one idea as lesser because it does not align with accepted reason is to reject the multiplicity that defines human understanding. In the contemplation of suicide as an intellectual proposition rather than an emotional collapse, one encounters the most fundamental conflict of philosophy itself, that existence demands justification without ever providing the means to fulfill it. The human mind, in its ceaseless pursuit of coherence, constructs narratives to conceal the chaos of being, and these narratives evolve into doctrines, moralities, and religions that pretend to know the purpose of what they cannot explain. To consider suicide not as corruption but as a possible resolution exposes the fragility of these narratives, for it implies that the freedom to end one's life carries the same dignity as the freedom to continue it. Such a notion does not glorify despair, but recognizes the sovereignty of consciousness, the right of each being to govern their own continuity. The equality of philosophies is then tested in the acceptance that even this stance holds equal ground among all others, neither superior nor inferior, merely another configuration of reason within the boundless spectrum of thought. The human mind, through its encounters with suffering, evolves its moral compass not through divine instruction, but through confrontation with the unbearable, and it is within that confrontation that one discovers the weight of choice. The absurdness of one philosophy mirrors another not because truth is inconsistent, but because perception itself is fractured, molded by the senses that interpret rather than reveal. To exist within such fractures is to accept that reason itself may be nothing more than a pattern invented to sustain order amidst the incomprehensible. The realization of this renders the question of right and wrong as irrelevant as the question of why existence began, for both inquiries emerge from the same uncertainty that no answer will ever satisfy. Thus, the freedom to think, to believe, and to end, remains the concluding execution of existence with that in the absence of absolute truth, choice itself becomes the only sacred act.

## Of Prosperous Violence

Heeding the service of violent implications towards humanity is a set of beliefs to rely on the consequential essence of one's heinous acts to prepare for substantial moral integration of judgment, in this judgment provides the depth of one's morale, whether they suffice to the social moral norms, or not. Yet it does not perceive committing the such as something catastrophic to one, or more, for one's own comprehension disintegrates the whole format of logic when perceiving the act themselves. In violence, we command the thought, and idealistic morale to fracture itself, the mind of its own to self-destruct, or commit interpersonal catastrophes, or damages, therefore manifesting the act of violence. This serves as a poison hallowing the essence of unconventional free-spirited commitments. The ego feeds its own to desire the perception of beauty behind violence against another. In theory, people desire violence, though they perceive such as something sacred to be committed for permanent destruction to one's well-being, thus creating a sense of distaste when experiencing it themselves, but do enjoy the acts only to be perceived, never felt. In conscientious sense, humans can determine the depths violence may lead themselves to become, broken-spirited, but never destroyed to the minute level of agony, which proceeds to serve more fear than initially anticipated, that in most cases, humans may project the desire for end of everything, instead of being served the bare minimum. In any case, violence is never justifiable, even with such, suicide does not integrate the act of violence, for it defies all the ideas previously stated. The existential dread driven by the thirst for violence is never to be entertained, rather simply dismantled, where the reliance of this pursuit drives themselves into another set of catastrophic outcomes leading to unconstitutional, and unlawful ramifications.

# Philosophical living

Whether the idealism behind living in a philosophical pursuit is a perplexing continuous inquiry revolves around humans. There isn't a definite concluding statement to that as such as every form of inquiry produces sorts of uncertainties within itself which procures the essence of inquiry of its own. A relentless question indifferent to substantial conclusions to proceed onto. I have since then, conducted a philosophical journey to uncover the philosophical bias of this method of living, where I conclude unclear insights of my personal empiricism to the idea, in favor to the senselessness of this method to be pursued, it does not present a significant essence to the desire of living, thus concluding suicidal ideation in pursuit, which is obviously unfavorable to the proceedings. In the process of searching for meaning is a fault of one's own distaste for the nature of life, within the constancy of agony. It suppresses the idea of freedom towards transcendence, when served with a dialectical approach towards the experience of suffering. One's unaccountability cherishes their self's lack of virtuous remorse, nor regret. It concludes the justification of their own sinful acts against the will of their religion, or peers—it simply rebels.

## Suicidal Virtues

In spite of the madness secured with deluded thoughts, people are kept to glorify the act of self-mutilation, or harm for eternity as a realistic form of natural escapade shifting to relentless unbound capabilities for living. There is a thought which precedes the whole purpose of life, and the pursuit of it, and that is as dangerous as the fearful nature of death itself, it is the conformity to the norms of social constructs, incompletely developed to regain sanity from unknowable mental urges. This can be a factor for the regeneration of mental suicide, with the lack of coherence to the main significance of life's purpose.

## Unity of Being

Beginning in a life, where ends may meet at a certain point of time distance, proceeds to fail the unification of an entity which concludes participation in the natural world, with life in different forms existing. To be disclosed of something trivial, and grandiosely elegant, the human mind provides life for their own to appreciate, and produce art forms which contracts the whole being of such. The artistic revolution precedes the end which procures further conflicts, it does not prepare for the case of mental madness, but the same beautiful torment appreciation awaits. The unity of being is prevented by segregation by the authority of art, and the forms it provides the most to someone's preference. As solely seen as an abundant attempt of vague self-expression. In the absence of said conflicts, disregard the essence of the sublime, that processes the development of molding of mental personalities. The case which prolongs the relation of self-expression to the prevention of segregation epitomizes the essence of humanity, and the authentic side of any. Self-expression continues to persuade its own effectivity to rely on the artist to generate the creation, and provides a sense of comfort from a unique standpoint of mental exertion, or usage not in a form of practical sense. Immersing oneself to the limits of their mental capabilities to create art provides

a thought of hollowness to their being, and the inherent meaninglessness without enough passion for such, or so what they might seem to think. The densely significance of the role of art in one's life is a streamline of complexities bound to be executed in a method that can be perceived, for the high appraisal of its existence to be manifested, where the simplest may be deemed unnecessary, whilst the complex are the composite nature of pure value by perception. It's a theorizing concept of human values in terms of improbable aspects of practical development for human advancements (this pertains to those factors such as Engineering, Mathematics, Medicine, Science, etc.). As we live to modify all the progress of containing those matters, we are driven to have inevitable engagements to human entertainment in terms of variety which constitutes to the main resource, and channel for self-expression, empirical senses, and evaluation, or simply just a nod to the natural consequences of the world, and for such, they are deemed as such; art, psychological imperatives for human incentives, and the preservation of human values, and formation. In addressing the unification of one's being, it is simply just implied for the importance of both factors of one's mental development.

Conclusive to the thought I have conducted is a belief in one's formal label of themselves, in the form of gracious intent to their own existence, and thus far exceeds the anticipation of longer life to live to the fullest. It is highly cumulative to one's own existence for their empirical senses to be satisfied with a myriad amount of suffering, and pleasure. In a philosophical sense, this natural experience comes from the instinct of humanity's trivial factor, the essence of overcoming. Regardless of the circumstances of one's experience, overcoming the whole ordeal, or fulfillment is a cyclical process, and a notion of one's definition of existence, and purpose. Without going deeper into the depths of one's exhaustive attempts of providing themselves with excessive amounts of validating acknowledgements from other entities, and societal judgments built by social constructs such as recognitions, titles, hierarchical labels. Those who practically oppose the need of these societal judgments are still bound to encounter the process of this occurrence at least once in their life if lived enough subjective to the person's capabilities. There isn't truly a factor of one's living to be completely fulfilled, if they didn't perish in sooner time, for they eventually end up to the circumstances of their life desiring to perish, just not technically reaching it initially.

## Human Incongruences

For those who claim to have not undergone any struggle to overcome it eventually are either liars, or have not lived long enough to become an essential human themselves, for life constitutes suffering in the midst of its existence. Are we yet to justify the significance of suffering itself, or bound to have collective distaste towards it? We practically do both, in a contradictory sense which defies natural processes itself, and thus creates social norms developed by humans, therefore integrating these norms to the culmination of human development. Existentially, these integrations and those who developed it are absolutely developing the norms for their own favor, and not for the sake of equality of beings ourselves, which presents another set of contradictions that we're tasked for ourselves to eradicate by setting another set of norms, which spreads into a constitution of social constructs, an element of identifying human essence in interpretations we're capable to obey, recognize, and favor ourselves in. In this cycle,

further complications happen, and thus create another factor for our own suffering, and the attempts to ameliorate, which ends up being a failure, but would follow by another set of attempts to discover endless amounts of predicaments to humankind, being ourselves the factor of our own self-destruction. With the help of our capabilities to develop social constructs destroys humanity's freedom in being transcendent from the heights of its culmination. How can social constructs slowly disintegrate the existential advantages of mankind? That seems to be the case we're having difficult times to explain for the rest of our time living, as we have merely justified the depths of it in aspects of our own desirable needs, and incentives, yet never the repercussions it serves for its integration. Taking the universal conflict of language which serves a solid barrier between the same species to understand each other, we were divided to have our own capabilities of having mental complexities with knowledge in terms of language, not in such a way as scientific endeavors that continuously provide discoveries which unifies the nature's truths, and unveil all the unifying aspects it may be extracted. The case of language defies the entirety of it, as it separates our minds, astray from being a unified whole. Language is a social construct which proceeds to define a divisive feature hindering mere higher heights for development, unidentifiable to everyone.

## The Will to Live

Many of those who are desired to live freely in a disclosed society, makes the notions impossible for them, done by themselves being the counterpart of their own viewpoint with the action of self-identification, and determination. And for their own fate to fall into circumstances unfavorable to them, would create a sense of distaste to their personal labels, incorporating the notion for necessity of aesthetic freedom, and rational freedom which everything of a factor in its own must be held accountable if not merely favourable to their options of living their lives to the fullest. We incorporate the desire to be inconsiderate with the depths of our own determination to the will to live in a hedonistic view, unparalleled to the struggling state our kind continuously experience. This collective viewpoint is not only unfavorable to the natural circumstances of life itself, but also in a transcendental aspect of human development. The will to live is to restrict oneself as well to become a free being, although one will not be obligated to do so. It is only for those who desire to be free themselves, in a society enclosed into echo chambers of worldviews which restrict one to explore further adjustments of their mind into something else newer to their empirical senses procuring justifications of a different kind of thinking.

In a form of labelling is a form of neglect to one's sole essence of a free being. Yet how do we constitute the succession of being free? Insofar for the cases which determine the identity of such, is a misconception to the reliance for a successful overcoming of being. But this does not cover the discussion about free being itself. For it is limited in another set of extensive discussion, although not exhaustive. The cases of determining the identity of a person (in such case, this contradicts the essential definition for a necessity of a free being), convolutes the thetical justification of a person's underlying personalities, and such, for distribution of their unique capabilities, and mere interests in certain fields, combined with the activities which defines the purpose of the person based from their responses in determining so, the antithetical

factor as I consider it. The deterred synthesis provides a comprehensive overview of the person's essential grasp of realistic living, of whether they identified as well their subjective purpose in life, or have failed to do so. The metrical assessment of this particular topic would indicate the eligibility of the person to be a candidate to become a free being on their own terms.

The distinct problem within this case is the lack of deeper understanding of a person who truly wants to be free, and thus affecting the commitment behind the purpose of doing so, and failing countless times. The self-commandment for this does not simply favor the side of living in flourish, and advantageously pleasurable in one's own preference. In order for one to become fully dedicated to their objective of being a free being constitutes the sacrifice of being well-versed initially to the notion of the former topic, the determination of one's identity to rely on the given conclusion by the evaluation of their own self-determination. This is all essentially done by the immense provocation of one's mental presence, and capabilities to comprehend the factors of being successfully evaluated by oneself. The rebellion behind the purpose of living normally will suffice the factors of identifying one's own identity, of whether they would broaden the approach for living, or to satisfy the lacking of their own performance. How does this work? By propagating the acts of selflessness of oneself to become world-centered, and not in reliance of one's own benefits only. In order to identify accurately is to understand the incorporated environment, and empirically present entities around the person themselves which mold their own capabilities, interests, and struggles, and source of meaning. We don't desire to be focused on our own self's evaluation of essence, but from the underlying factors which caused us to become as such initially, and this will hold to the notion of selflessness, and defy the limits of one's empirical understanding. This would also be necessary for recalcitrance, instituting the impact of our own strong sense of disregard to our consideration to our own physical, and psychological endeavors, and features. According to Soren Kierkegaard that "Once you label me, you negate me" in simplest terms from his "The Sickness unto Death" book also simplifies the whole concept of this whole extraction, yet in a more complicated manner of explaining, that of which sheds full light on this argumentative notion of worldview. In further suggesting this philosophy furnishes the concept of free being.

The concept of free being glorifies the capabilities of malleability outside of their own terms in situations unfavorable to them. They're most powerful in aspects of mental grasp, and procurement to become stoic in times of gradual despair, and crisis. But that doesn't only just end the endless possibilities of becoming one rarely out of all. In a more complex manner of thinking, being such is a streamline refinement of one's subject aspects, in presence of one's defiance of their own morality, suffering, personal restrictions, and environmental-concerned consciousness, which inherently thwarts the process of understanding the world, and oneself thoroughly, and grasp the resilience to constant adjustments of every factor in play surrounding their existence.

In Nietzsche, and Spinoza's polar personal philosophies with similar characteristics, and points of views regarding their concepts (free-spirit/free-person), the concept of mine is simply a misconception of one who reads it to be an

underdeveloped concept compared to the two, yet I presume to differ, as I constitute the essential insights regarding the unique characteristics, and capabilities of such, extensively in this notable section in the book, although I must not disclose that this could be the part which requires the most proactive attention, ingestion, and mental processing, for the reason of the inadequacy with the performance I've executed to create, and the additional inferiority with the quality of dedication I've collected for constructing the whole dissection.

The psychoanalysis behind the mental effects of this particular contrary defiant from the active typical living, minding the considerations of mental shifts this kind of adjustment would require, is also an extensive discussion to dissect of which I will attempt to be as concise as possible, but still being able to provide the necessary details. In all seriousness with regards to the process of the construction of this whole work, I dedicated to have it as concise as possible in terms of the length of the collective ponderings, avoiding the sacrifice of the potential reader's time to waste for determining the slight sensibility of my words, and provide a strong detraction for refuting my nonsensical claims. Although I made prolonged effort to furnish the words to convey accurate interpretations of my ponderings, I admit to myself that I have created a decent work overall, after the process of the creation of this Recalcitrance from conforming to one's own simple terms of living. I now attempt to divert back to the main discussion, due to my sudden change of streamline focus with explaining, yet concluding instead with an expression of my personal denouncements to my own justified viewpoints of which I find difficult to categorize as "philosophies" for it provides lacking substantial effort to serve proper interpretation of an empirical sense towards philosophical living, yet I've finalized an entire judgment of such (in the process of realization, we can notice the heavy reliance, and influence it impacts my philosophical claims to Empiricism, paving wider idealization, and grasp to my whole spectrum of notions). Narrowing down further on the psychoanalysis of the free being mental integration complicates the entirety of this, although it also sheds a beam of light to reflect the underlying interpretations of this evaluation, which are factors in play to reach the culmination of the set of specific characteristics to define the whole identity. Without further blockages of stream of thought towards the conceptualization of this particular idea, I forlornly expose the trivial, boring, repetitive, and grandiose nullifying factors for deeper understanding of the human mind in the case of which I presented (free being), constituent to the initial idea of this whole book. I must inform you primarily regarding the mere focus of your perception of my work as something developmental, or progressive, not as a method of gathered ideas being scattered in distant places in the book resembling a puzzle craft. Although I shall not classify this as evolutionary, as it is highly flawed in terms of the historical accounts I am obliged to provide to back up the claims I've gathered for exposition. Hindering the sights of a moral individual towards an unparalleled act against their own moral integration suppresses the perception of advantageous utilization of mental privileges a mind could perform to defy the limited capabilities of it. In the case of a free being disregards the yielding of morality for their mental judgment on their circumstantial dilemmas. There wouldn't be detrimental consequences for this particular pursuit, yet rather just an immense amount of difficulty with the problematic nature of the character's primary origin, and the accurate comprehension of the entire phenomenon itself by the individual. There is a

gist of thought within ourselves for those who can properly conceptualize this character as something for it to be implausible, creating a large contradiction to the whole argument itself, being a subject for refutation. Lowering the defense for the essentiality of becoming a free being incorporates a sense of lack of passion for humans towards freedom, for their total misconception of the concept of "Freedom".

What exactly is freedom in simplest terms? We can determine freedom as a kind of personal perception as a privilege for ourselves to explore the world in our own preferred terms, and methods, which includes the perceptive exploration of nature, characteristics, historical features, gratifying factors, and other further complexities of the world. Thus, for that we differ in each of our cases, this develops an external inevitable oppositional method, or worldviews towards our own approaches for freedom. The cycle of conflict determines the problem within the justification of our own methods, forging the chaotic discourses between ourselves in order for our own integration, and utilization of our freedom. With freedom subject to our own offenses the other separate subjection of one's own freedom generates some sort of personal violent judgments, which is incongruent to the characteristics of freedom itself, as such would invalidate the absolute essential definition of it. The personal judgment processes the string of thought of an individual for a pattern of actions, and determinations to certain situational difficulties of judgment, therefore retaining the sense of logic in applying these consequential actions to alleviate such circumstances.

Freedom in its essential form would be considered for such as a type of identity within individual considerations of every person who possesses it, which favours the thought that it would be in our case, completely optional for the integration on our own terms. This particular existential form of a concept is dreadful to those who wish to surpass the utilization into something substantially justified in one's living. Uncertain determination to the developmental effects of this specific pursuit remains a timeless perplexion for our capabilities of assessment. Partial containments of an individual's personality grasp the entirety of the practical sense of freedom, thus as such insinuates the justified relevance to it compacting reasoning, with gradual circumstantial judgment, and course of action fairly combined. We dare to compel ourselves to set the judgment of our own behaviors, and systemic actions through the process of which can be favourable to our own conceptualization of freedom. In the largest problem of being subjective, we are deemed to incline into chaotic responses due to encountered conflicts of notions. Distinguishing the necessity of freedom plays a large role for someone to be societally conscious, not only individually, to acknowledge the limitations of living, not to become an encouragement for defying it. There is another sort of psychological adjustments which creates activities performing as hindrance of a whole set of particular qualifying actions which defines the openness of mind, and the freedom it decides to pursue (as for those who are on the basis of lacking belief of so-called "freedom" and the uncertainty of its essence to one's mind as it may seem). Will there be a fault behind this particular misconstruction of psychological degree of certainty in our flawed cognition? As to my own observations, it does seem to have this kind of problem concluded in the sense of discontinuation of certainty, and to have assurance on the basis towards objective truth. And so, with such, I clearly attest the major incongruence behind this, not just within the concept of cognition, or the hardships of searching the

mythological objective truth, but to also have inductive addition to unnecessary hindrances which are capable to discontinue the sensibility of the whole process, or to dismantle the partial unity of cognition between justified collective worldviews. As towards having to heavily ensure the particulars behind the sole case of search for truth, in our own methodological incompetency, and incongruences in our ways, we tend to create difficulties on our ends to satisfy these kinds of incentives to our mental assurance, and cognitive objectiveness. Causes for that are several but all play a major part of destroying the sense of this kind of psychological expedition, which are classified as such: Endless incoherence, and lack of the capability to comprehend classified notions offered by either nature, or different kinds of cognitive generation. This kind of hindrance slows down the pacing to seek, and accept a deeper understanding of our natural knowledge, and sciences. What complicates our own understanding is also to create the illusion of certainty which falls apart from the actual bases of the truth we are assigned to seek.

Following the process of incorporating freedom within the continuation of life without the mental grasp of the whole concept prior to the pursuit of these human foundational values. Although generally considered as such, it discontinues the essential purpose of it once it is well used. Kant's large amount of writings pertaining to his own view of freedom differs from the one which Sartre thinks, and so on with Marx, Hitler, and Jesus. In avoidance to the extensive discourse regarding the state of freedom in a subjective mind of our own in a collective manner, dissolves all unity of being, in a justification of which proceeds to entangle the proper understanding of what must be considered as "Freedom". It is certainly predetermined for our own sense to discover freedom in our own terms, as much as how we would view it as such, for it gratifies the longing for one's deeper understanding, and need for the similar philosophies which the concept provides, it is inevitably essential to one's mind. I disregard the sense of being absolute with my own trivial understanding of what freedom can be, although I seem to make it such impactful in the life I choose to live in, and so as others who seek to navigate it, but left astray, or those who chose to think otherwise. The mental incapability (in terms of making this as their own pursuit of virtue) of one who desires to conjugate the format of every logical thought, or simply just a coherent concluding viewpoint of this concept is already challenged enough to make it clear for themselves to the comprehension of freedom, yet it does not create a categorical disposition of the maddening mind to dislocate the pursuit towards it. What can be solely incomprehensible to the senses of a person gives urges to find a way for them to have a deeper understanding of it, not just for the sake of knowledge, but also for the sake of pursuit.

To make clearer glimpses of the free being, I expose the whole characteristics behind this particular unconventional kind of superiority on its own. Powerful adherence to one of their own terms is the largest factor of being this particular kind. Where the person maintains to be unmoved, or unthreatened to any source, and circumstances of compulsion, or causations which defines the oppositional stand of being. My warmest gratitude for Kant to deliver the thorough position of human autonomy, as the free being possesses this specific trait. Though highly contradictory for me to have some sort of classification to a person who defies the natural law of

restrictions, boundaries, and nullification, I stand to be left obligated to have the floor to give an exposition to the particular, for narrowed identification of such. In a mere situation, a free being never proceeds to have the taste for any sort of philosophy, or dogmatic thinking, as it pushes to act on its own depending on the consequential occurrences, it bends its way to take malleability as a sort of advantageous rotoscope of existence, and essentiality of movement, and action. To give an even further dissection of this particular being, I proceed not in admiration alone, but in the necessity to extract its elusive essence into a clearer grasp of the human mind. A free being is not positioned merely as a phenomenon among men, but rather as an extraordinary stance of existence that refuses subjugation to imposed design created by our own kind (simply pertaining to surpassing the heights of our own capabilities, and possibilities). Its superiority does not emerge from domination over others, but from its self-possessed stillness against what the world imposes, necessity, or compulsion. The being's refusal to surrender to external definitions, or to inherit identities imposed by tradition or system, becomes its certification of distinctiveness farther from the characteristics of a flawed human. In this resistance, we must assume that this is not a strong act as a creature of rebellion, but rather as one of pure establishment of self in response to being self-comprehension, unrelenting, unbending, yet not rigid. For if it were rigid, it would collapse under the very weight of its denial of compulsion, that of which the whole self-integrates to deflect. Instead, its structure lies in malleability itself, in bending without breaking, in flowing without losing integrity.

This peculiar paradox is the heart of the free being: one who defies while also existing in quiet accord with what must be faced. Its choices emerge not from determinism, nor from mere chance, but from a deliberate posture of autonomy that is not reducible to any given system of thought. It is here where Kant’s moral autonomy resonates, though in this case extended beyond duty into the raw territory of existential placement. If we were to place this being beside Sartre’s condemned freedom, or even Nietzsche’s sovereign individual, the Übermensch, we might find resonances, but never identity, for the free being exceeds each frame. Its classification, though seemingly contradictory, is necessary if only to give words to a phenomenon that might be too vast for description. And so, my analysis continues to circle the ineffable, knowing the impossibility of fully capturing it, yet still bound to the task of describing how this being lives unmoved, unpossessed, and unbroken by the laws and compulsions that render most others tethered.

There really isn't much else to say for further exposition of this kind, as already have given justifications of its existence (if such a person exists), but I've given the full accounted characteristics this particular being proceeds to maintain as. The will to live is to immensely appeal to the power of a relentless scorch undone, and applied by a man, bound by his own sanity, and society.

## Valuing the String of Thought

To finalize the entirety of this abominable discourse, I presume my certainty with regards to having self-determined search for the philosophical essence, of whether the heed of philosophy takes place in one's life to make it complete in such a way of making

the particular individual feel the need for it in inevitable occurrences. There's a finite amount for conducting courses of action to deliberate the certain vindictiveness of the act itself. In such, we reconcile the resources to the circumstances, in between which may simply procure the particular action to be socially permissible, and personally applicable in management of organizational procurement. Akin to the distinction between philosophical approach, to a practical one constitutes not only the certain factors involved, but the nature it withholds to make a constant delivery unified with the absolute circumstance it imposes. A cliché in adherence to the general sense of encouragement for independence of autonomy, one may extract this flaw and turn it against itself to compromise the notion, and to find a different path of personal autonomy, therefore also defying the norms, and developing itself to become its own philosophy. And thus, which creates the justifying cause for philosophical discourse on one's method of living in a non-philosophical world.

What philosophy simply implies itself as is the sense of reliance to whatever may indicate total difference to the societal norms, and adherences, in pertaining to be classified as an outlier to the mental constructs of human mind, therefore allowing our transcendental mental capabilities to conceptualize another form of dogma. Philosophy is a form of dogma which glorifies the central idea of the particular to be comprehended clearly, and to be pursued in a way of deepening romanticization that is simply unhealthy in one's mental health, and well-being. With much consideration to this, however—gradually prepares disintegration to the fullest of its own terms, in a deceptive manner unknowable to the causes it preserves. It is untimely for an individual to attain consciousness to the depths of philosophizing in any time of their life, opposing the circumstances which are highly practical to the individual, implying the impracticalities of its nature. Joining the forces of human autonomy with the integration of philosophical approach in living towards the end of one's life apart from the path of detrimental transcendence, or what we refer to as practical suicide (in one note, I aim to illuminate the nature of it in the next exposition.) Whether the impracticality of philosophizing with one's own mental benefit into the pursuit of better living, or otherwise, does not manifest a dispute of thinking such in a way which favours the conceptualization of philosophy. In simpler implications; there exists a certain thought of disregard towards the act of philosophizing, but with pure adherence to the fascinating nature of it, we remain to stay on its path to our personal pursuit, the unavoidable conformity of mind.

# Continuity of Suicide

Continuity is simply a state of being continuous in a manner of time diluted by the depths of profound humanism (Suicide in particular). Although this occurs constantly in a state of continuity itself just only with factors contradicting the process of the whole. It does not justify the endlessness of being in itself. The dilution destroys the essence of gathering mental construct of self-judgment to end the suffering of a person, it compacts all of it, then violently releases the entirety of its own causing the manner of self-destruction not inclined to death, and also affecting other factors in one's environment. It does not provide a point of being where we experience certainty in procurement of joy, or pleasurable end in our own terms. The act of suicide itself, as already firmly justified in a practical sense, does provide that exact certainty in defining one's own life to be experienced, towards death with own satisfaction without the need of a struggle behind living it through. Although this causes not to set an opportunity for a person to become a free being themselves for they will end a life (which is an essential part of the process) to avoid the experience of a normal human to sense. They transcend towards a progression polar to the transcendental progress I have presented which requires the feeble mind of human beings to culminate, and achieve. There is a different kind of transcendence with doing the act of suicide, of which is the concept of "Detrimental Transcendence". This will be extracted thoroughly for better understanding shortly. Focusing first in the purpose of this section—I continue (no pun intended) not to divert our minds towards the mindset of having shame, or distaste for suicide. Strongly, I hold this argument dearly as I am certain of the underlying effects this could cause for the person who would pursue this personal virtue.

Detrimental transcendence tramples the heights of despair a person would experience, it contracts the whole well-being of a person with pure consideration to it as a method of coping but in a form of ending things to reach the unknowable conclusion of one's life. It serves a merely unachievable nature for those who proceed to subject themselves into a typical lifelong cherishing of life (in metrics of a human's lifespan). But for those who have reached this particular stage in reasons countless to be fathomed, had made to seek the achievable side of its nature narrowing a myriad amount of insights to this uniqueness of experience, although can never shed the light for those who haven't achieved this kind of transcendence. This is completely familiar to the transcendence of Christ in his biblical life as a humanistic epitome of a God, a celestial being of transcendence in practical terms, and by which Jesus Christ have achieved his own entity-based means without being able to shed full light on the essential overview to the character.

In a similar manner, corrosive ascent describes another form of self-destructive transcendence. Here, the individual’s accounted suffering is not processed, or alleviated but entirely erased by turning to final closure of its own persistence. The pursuit of survival is reinterpreted as the decision to end simply the existence, narrowing the scope of human flourishing, and eliminating the possibility of recovery, or growth in the midst of accepting the nature of being insufferable, or the capability of positivism. What is simply perceived as a means of overcoming suffering becomes, in practice, the negation of the self to the will of legitimate living. The conceptualization highlights a critical

paradox within human coping mechanisms, and the psychoanalysis behind. This particular attempt to transcend despair can, if directed toward self-destructive solutions, transform into a process that undermines life itself, yet still beneficial to the sustainable nature life can be constituted into. Rather than enabling renewal, such approaches collapse into termination for absolute deliberation to escape the gist of suffering. This particular notion highly demonstrates the importance of distinguishing between constructive and destructive forms of transcendence itself, as only the former can sustain human well-being, and the possibility of meaningful recovery from the depths of despairing autonomy. What remains as a social, and personal construct of discrepancies to the human capabilities withholds the power to transcendence, and the liberating sense of comfort.

The surface of detrimental transcendence propagates the use of formal disadvantage to rely on the brighter side of the spectrum which the human psyche decides to view as. There are human conditions which may compromise the foundational discourse between human authenticity. There are occurrences which compels us to culminate the embrace for imminent death, whether in a hyperbolic sense, figurative, or in a literal sense of which some particular individuals tend to seek, or pursue, therefore withholding the act of detrimental transcendence into utilization for absolute resolution to the recurring problem, or issue. Regardless of the sincerity of this desire, it simply implicates the essentiality of the entire notion to constitute towards the incentive needs of the individual. The predestined string of ideas which conceptualizes the notion itself fosters the whole necessity of it, not only in the psychological sense of conformity to resolve the essential problem, but with regards to the total justification of it in terms of practical application, and approach. What we come to incline ourselves to consider as unfathomable, we desire to make it happen on our own terms in particular circumstances in crisis of our well-being's stability. That ultimately classifies humankind to gain transcendental capabilities complicated in perception of personal approaches, as certainly not in the definition of my own, but for a different sense of pathway to ascendancy of which procures the pessimistic view in reliance on realism's foundational worldviews. The big problem is the lack of self-determination of humanity to its kind to be instilled with belief to be capable of pursuing this particular phenomenon, and thus continuing the common thought of reliance on other beings defined as capable, whilst setting moral judgments for those who relied on themselves to begin with. In methods which constitute the substantial causes, and scope of committing into the act of Detrimental transcendence occupy the long sense of hollowness of a human. The act itself meddles with the sense of personal gratitude to the life given to them by the incorporation of applying law of large numbers in terms of reproduction to a kind they attribute into. The particular life of a human, in its propagation, often disguises itself as a moral victory rather than a statistical consequence, and within that disguise humanity cultivates a false sense of indebtedness, believing that to exist is to owe reverence to the unknown will that preceded them. The cycle of reproduction has long been regarded as the proof of divine intention, yet what persists through it is not the continuity of purpose but the endurance of instinct. The sense of gratitude one feels toward being alive is not born from realization but from conditioning, inherited through generations that have mistaken survival for meaning. To live because others have lived becomes a sacred commandment, yet the holiness of

that commandment dissolves once one recognizes that the process requires no sanctity to continue. The numerical certainty of life's recurrence strips individuality from creation, turning existence into a repetition of outcomes rather than a miracle of consciousness. This transforms the sentiment of appreciation into compliance, as though to question the necessity of being to violate the moral order of existence itself. Gratitude thus becomes an expectation rather than a realization, imposed upon the mind that never consented to its arrival. The human impulse to preserve the species, to extend its own reflection across generations, is not an act of altruism but of biological self-assurance, an unconscious repetition of probability disguised as purpose. The more humanity multiplies, the more diluted the sense of individuality becomes, for every birth confirms not the uniqueness of life but the inevitability of it. The law of large numbers ensures that existence, in its totality, favors continuity over consciousness, and within this mechanism, gratitude loses its anchor, for the gift that was never personally given cannot be personally thanked. The illusion of meaning arises when the individual assumes that their presence carries a significance independent of the statistical necessity that produced it. To live with such belief is to participate in a system that disguises repetition as purpose and reproduction as destiny. The appreciation for life then becomes not an expression of freedom but an inherited duty, a performance enacted to maintain the structure of affirmation that society demands. The moral justification for such gratitude relies not upon truth but upon fear, for to be ungrateful to existence is to stand outside the order of those who find comfort in belonging. Yet belonging, when forced by birth, cannot be a virtue; it is merely a condition accepted out of the absence of choice. The mind that recognizes this becomes both liberated and isolated, for the understanding that one's life may be nothing more than the outcome of countless probabilities severs the emotional thread that binds gratitude to obligation. From that point, existence is no longer sacred but factual, and the awareness of its factuality removes the necessity for reverence. To be born, therefore, is not to receive a gift, but to be introduced into a pattern whose continuation depends on one's unawareness of its mechanical nature. Those who see through this pattern confront a silent paradox: that meaning can only exist when one refuses to see life as statistical, yet clarity itself destroys the illusion that sustains it. The multitude of beings who live, suffer, and die contributes to the aggregate of the species, not the elevation of the individual, and the realization of this brings forth the most unsettling question as for whether gratitude has any foundation when life itself is indifferent to its receiver. The sense of duty toward life is then a mirror reflecting the fear of irrelevance, a fear inherited rather than chosen, conditioned through the narrative that one must be thankful simply for existing. Yet existence, stripped of narrative, offers neither reward nor punishment, it merely continues through probability. To thank it is to humanize what has no intention, to moralize what has no moral. The burden of gratitude becomes a means to stabilize the illusion of meaning, ensuring that those who live remain bound to the act of continuation, even when continuation brings no enlightenment. In that light, the preservation of the species becomes not a celebration of life, but a repetition of necessity. The belief that one must be grateful to their progenitors becomes an echo of biological instinct disguised as virtue, for they too were born into the same unchosen rhythm of existence. When seen from a wider perspective, life itself is neither a miracle nor a mistake, but a recurrence, a pattern that thrives on numbers and probabilities rather

than intentions or destinies. The mind that dares to perceive this cease to view gratitude as moral currency and begins to understand it as an emotional adaptation meant to soften the discomfort of randomness. To exist within this truth is to experience both liberation and solitude, for gratitude no longer provides comfort when the reason for it dissolves. The individual, separated from the collective illusion, must then decide whether to invent new meaning or to exist without any. In either case, life continues unaffected, for its mechanism requires no human justification. The attempt to assign significance to being becomes the very act that distances humanity from understanding it, and the insistence on gratitude sustains that distance. If gratitude is the acknowledgment of a gift, then existence, in its impartial repetition, offers none, for a gift requires intention, and life has none to offer. The continuity of humankind, through the lens of probability, is a testament to persistence, not purpose, to repetition, not revelation. Those who recognize this find that their sense of thanks shifts inward, away from the giver that does not exist, toward the awareness that existence itself is the only certainty one can claim. In that awareness lies the quiet form of freedom, where gratitude transforms from obligation into understanding, and the individual finally perceives that to be alive is not a privilege owed, but an occurrence witnessed

# ETHICAL DISCOURSES

# IV

# Unrealism, and disillusionment through understanding of ethics, and my propositions for moral transcendence (Prelude)

# Raskolnikov’s Faith

It is a fascinating life Raskolnikov from Dostoyevsky's Crime & Punishment lived through the pages from the start of it. Grave mistakes became a struggle for redemption morally, physically, and mentally. His vigorous overcoming of this obstacle was a great narrative from the author of whom have shown very accurate depictions of true moral distinction from conventional clichés. It isn't necessarily convenient to live, thus hardships earned were fixed for compensation to live more, of which in Raskolnikov's case, this is the central interest of his life after the murder, and robbery. Conviction by himself in shackles to provide motivation for his wellbeing to deteriorate fascinates an innate execution of his psyche to his consequential acts of violence, and regrettable circumstances to which proceeds to fulfill his desire for existential crisis, and hatred. His psychology is a practical use for an advantageous mind due to the lack of self-destruction, and moral constrictions. Yearning greatness by his mind as a sign of travesty for moral-less acts is a captured sense of humour to one's human nature, a nature flawed to be an endeavor for any kind of transcendence, yet given advantageous circumstances on living which are compromised by the flaws it is attributed to.

Longing for a soulless journey to something significant for his meaningless existence contributes to his motivation to journeying towards somewhere soulful, trying to come up with a method of fitting in, whilst all aware of being left, and fitted out up to his own end. Him living progressively is a quest for impossibility of placidity in a chaotic mess within nature of Godless world (in his wholehearted perspective). A fight for freedom is a choice, but never a responsibility of whom it desires to procure freedom, and stand against authority who eludes comprehension to everyone. The desire for freedom is merely human (as it's an inferior sense). Resistance is an own selective act, shaped by choice, context, and emotional capacity. It is unjust to expect the oppressed to challenge systems built on complexity, and obscurity. When authority operates through inaccessible structures, and faceless bureaucracy, accountability must not shift to those most burdened by it. Demanding rebellion from the vulnerable misplaces one's sense of moral, and social responsibility towards those who have fully disregard the thought in itself to be a particular value for every individual. The ethical onus to reform lies with those who design and benefit from opaque power, not those merely trying to endure it. Freedom may inspire absolute action, but it must never compel sacrifice of something greater than the goodness of one's soul.

Human beings are perhaps most vulnerable when they attempt to surpass the very boundaries that give shape to their existence. The mind, though capable of remarkable abstraction, reasoning, and creativity, remains tethered to the finite conditions of human experience. Yet it is precisely this tension between aspiration and limitation that generates some of the most profound struggles in both individual psychology and collective history. The human desire to elevate thought beyond ordinary comprehension, to arrive at truths unshaken by circumstance, is admirable in its ambition, but dangerous in its consequences when left unchecked by humility or ethical grounding. In the search for transcendence, what often emerges is not clarity but distortion: the individual mistakes his own self-created theories for universal laws, and

in doing so, becomes blind to the fragile, complex web of reality. This is not ignorance in its purest form, nor is it knowledge in its most refined sense. It is instead a middle ground, a liminal state where thought bends back upon itself, producing grand illusions that masquerade as truths. The human being, convinced of his superiority, may begin to believe that he possesses not merely insight but authority, a dangerous shift that transforms intellectual pursuit into psychological domination. At this point, the mind becomes its own tyrant, imprisoning itself within the logic of its delusions, unable to distinguish between what is rationally possible and what is merely self-justified invention. Such a state does not arise in isolation. It is nourished by fear, anxiety, and often an underlying sense of inadequacy, though these roots remain hidden beneath the surface of intellectual confidence. To peer into this paradox is to glimpse the fragility of consciousness itself: that in attempting to escape the limits of humanity, one may end up collapsing more profoundly into them, and in that collapse, generate consequences that extend far beyond the self. It is here that psychology and philosophy converge, as both fields attempt to diagnose the inherent dangers of overreaching reason. The failure is not in the ambition to know, but in the refusal to accept the impossibility of knowing absolutely, which in turn breeds a desperation that manifests as destructive action. This phenomenon reminds us that the greatest errors of human thought often come not from laziness or negligence, but from the restless will to exceed, to dominate, and to impose coherence where ambiguity and uncertainty are essential to human reality.

Yet if this particular complicated dynamic represents a universal condition of the human mind, its most vivid expression is revealed in the psychological drama of individuals who embody the struggle to reconcile thought with action, delusion with morality, and superiority with failure. Such figures are not merely characters of literature or philosophy, but living representations of the tensions that define the human condition. Their lives become sites of inquiry into what happens when the intellect, intoxicated by its own power, abandons humility and yields to self-created myths of grandeur. It is here that one begins to recognize the destructive fusion of misanthropy, alienation, and pride. The individual, convinced of his uniqueness, separates himself from the moral frameworks that bind others, dismissing empathy as weakness and community as mediocrity. He withdraws into the solipsistic echo of his own thoughts, constructing a worldview in which the legitimacy of action arises not from shared values but from personal conviction. But the psyche, despite its illusions of autonomy, cannot entirely sever itself from the demands of conscience or the weight of guilt. Thus, in such figures we find the paradox of a mind both liberated and imprisoned: liberated in the sense that it refuses external authority, imprisoned in the sense that it is enslaved to its own delusions. The conflict between these opposing forces generates a psychological turbulence that cannot easily be resolved. Fear and cowardice linger beneath the façade of strength, while anticipation of some transformative destiny becomes an unbearable burden. In such cases, violence emerges not merely as an external act but as a distorted manifestation of internal collapse. Philosophy, in dialogue with psychology, exposes this as the inevitable outcome of elevating thought above morality, of confusing superiority with truth, and of mistaking intellectual rebellion for existential freedom. The tragedy lies not in the failure to achieve greatness, but in the destruction caused by pursuing it under the illusion of self-made divinity. His fragment of life highlights the inferiority of a human's mind to think far beyond his limits, as

other people certainly also do, inevitably leading into failure for betterment, that doesn't allow something worse to occur not only for Raskolnikov, but others as well. His wholehearted belief in himself, and only himself employs a deeper sense of committing heinous acts against humanity due to the motivation of his misanthropic tendencies, constantly bugging him, with anticipation of something larger to occur. Raskolnikov is full of fear, and cowardice driving the danger of imploding personal heat to destroy his own moral compass, and put catastrophic damage to others. His psyche conflicts with the agency of faith from his surroundings from the people he is intimate with. Although his faithlessness epitomizes his misanthropic virtues, it does not highlight that being faithless provides the essence of guilt from committing violence towards those he wishes to perish. The mental superiority of which Raskolnikov classifies himself as, is a form of justification to his own cause for chaos, due to his personal delusion of grandeur as a God. There really isn't much complex behind his own particular string of thoughts, only mere confusion we decide not to comprehend behind his course of actions to deliver his own personal theory of human nature. He attempts to incline himself with the promising nurture of humankind to its own, yet somehow unimaginably fails to make it, just as much as the failure to make the failure itself subtle. The comical psychological nature of Raskolnikov creates the unique feeling to the reader who tries to put themselves in the shoes of the character. When it comes to approach the study of a fractured mind is to encounter the fragile line between rational self-possession and destructive self-deception, a line that reveals how the inner world may collapse under the pressure of unacknowledged impulses. When thought becomes consumed by its own inventions, the individual begins to inhabit a realm where the justification of action no longer arises from communal standards but from a distorted self-image. What emerges is not clarity but distortion, as the desire to affirm one’s strength conceals a deeper instability that erodes both judgment and moral direction. This condition, marked by the tension between intellectual ambition and psychological fragility, generates acts that appear deliberate yet are driven by unresolved inner turmoil. The struggle itself cannot be reduced to a mere flaw of character, for it embodies the paradox of a consciousness at once aware of its missteps and yet powerless to escape their consequences. In this sense, the portrayal of an individual caught between self-exaltation and self-destruction becomes a reflection of broader questions about the human tendency to mistake delusion for insight, and to pursue certainty even when it leads to collapse. The psychological analysis of Dostoyevsky in Rodya's mental state created a culminating height for human understanding to the accuracy of the concept of guilt itself, and towards psychopathy.

# Objectivity Over Morality

[1] An individual is compelled to obligate themselves into a recycling nature of pursuing actions in accordance with their moral compass, rather than dissatisfaction of obeying unadvised thought highlighting the essence of one being an authentic "human". It isn't how absurd I could judge the recurring succession of this method of living within humans, but the emphasis behind striking out the whole thought, erasing the significance of the presumed obligation. In the process of life itself of a human, the one who yields in pursuit of satisfying the general's moral compass is deemed superior, although they demonstrate meekness beyond comprehension of the mass, leading into chasing the exact conduct. The concept of moral compass was ingrained in human nature ages ago, generating ethical dilemmas, discomfort shifts in their natural perception, and actions towards a set of processes in maintaining life itself to the fullest extent of what one could reach. This phenomenon of yielding to morality, despite its prolonged complexity and challenges, underscores the inherent struggle of fragility of the human condition, where objective authenticity often competes with rational conformity. Yet, it is in such a struggle that humanity finds its essence, as the pursuit of moral integrity becomes a reflection of the deeper larger quest for meaning and purpose in life in addition to obeying rules for the sake of progression.

[2] In the progress of living, one may assume conforming to a fixed general moral compass associating into eternal improvement of the quality of life for the person, whilst some think otherwise. The whole ordeal proposes a conflict of viewpoints, though it is commonly disregarded due to the permanence of the code enterprising morality through every individual. While the complete permanence of a generalised moral compass offers a hardship for stability, it may also stifle individual exploration, of defining morality by sheer reasoning. The tension between adhering to inconclusive vast universal codes, and pursuing subjective values highlights a delicate balance of living which is one that continues to evolve as societies grow, and coexistence interacts. Thus, the argument on moral conformity being it as moral subjectivity remains an unresolved, yet essential, factor of human development.

[3] Even the essence of logic contributed significantly to produce the complex nature, and form of morality, and how it suppresses the minds of every individual who perceives it. The confession of its profundity is the highest shame for me to declare, and the admiration to its complexity surpasses the culmination of human thought that's worth an entire millennium. Long before it became apparent, coherence behind the characteristics of morality had been attempted to be brought by the most brilliant theologians, further spectrum of theists, and the wonder for the subjective purpose of every individual's life. Hindered by the spirits of soulful juiciness of theological philosophies written in gospels, and scraps of testaments integrated by theists, morality had been far up existing even before the consciousness of man was developed to be acknowledged. The glorifying recognition of morality as a construct of human logic, and emotion reveals some sort of divided, or dual nature, completely a system perfectly bound by rationality, yet profoundly personal in its influence for every individual who perceives it, and subject for integration. This dichotomy behind morality forms the cornerstone of profound ethical discourse, where reason seems to search for

understanding the roots of morality, while emotion fuels the passion for its application. In this light, morality becomes both a complex science, and an art, a practical synthesis of humanity’s greatest intellectual and emotional endeavors, from the mere meekness, and the romanticization of its stagnant inferiority.

[4] The relentless growth of religion beyond the abundance of classical interest from their respected ideals influenced largely on the development of morals, although it can already be contemplated that the origin of such a concept is indirectly derived from the whole complicated nature of religion itself, a flower that grew from concrete. With the influence of religion (in this stage, people pursue religion due to the proposed salvation of their frivolity, and the preservation of unanswered wonders left unanswered, or given an option to believe a particular uncertainty as permanent consolation.) ancient individuals rely on this leap of faith to justify an ethical living, in accordance with the development of the world's natural resources. It may be highlighted how the importance of morality becomes highly significant, after a stagnancy of selfishness natural in a human's perception. Religion's vital role in shaping the concept of moral values demonstrates the unique human tendency to seek proper guidance through good faith, especially when grappling with the common fear of the mass, which is the unknown. The transition from selfish instincts to collective morality through widespread religious influence showcases a pivotal evolution in societal values. It invites personal reflections on how faith and reason have historically intertwined, molding not just individual lives but entire civilizations in the pursuit of ethical coexistence for implementation of the masses.

[5] Only one could determine the objectiveness of morality, God as the common served element, that being said… Objectivity, and morality can never coexist on the same page for one's pursuit to declare, and share for the whole civilization of humanity to discover, and finally execute properly. As we're ungodly beings, our degree of comprehension, and ability to perceive transcendental elements are obscured, down to inferiority. Regardless of our mankind's drastic improvement, our species will never meet to equalize the ability to execute an incomprehensive view of objectivity, which on this behalf, is morality. Just how irredeemable the objective-absolute truth is, makes a larger consideration for the case of morality. The acceptance of the unattainability of objective morality invites humanity to solidly redefine its ethical aspirations within the boundaries of particular subjective experiences. While perfection may remain strictly elusive, the pursuit itself holds intrinsic value, driving continuous improvement, and integrating humility which is unavoidable for a natural evolution of a child currently. An expensive acknowledgment of our inevitable limitations serves not as a deterrent, but as a circular profound reminder of the hollowness inherent in the journey of moral discovery.

[6] Morality is subjective! Any rational human being is set to prove this statement, otherwise they aren't rational enough to be a part of the inclusion. A rational man just as mentioned, being aware of the concept itself is enough to agree on the fact how accurate this simplistic claim has to be. A treacherous madman judged dead by death penalty is grieved by the unjustness of the government who condemned him, or be celebrated for less a perilous person this world has to offer for other undeserving

individuals. The sheer conviction of mercy killing a helpless dog, is a lifelong proposal of illegality by a perceiver of the act, or be glorified proudly by another who speaks the betterment for dogs that suffer from helplessness. In an undesired perspective of a cruel man, is a reliever for a normal one. This subjectivity, while strongly evident in such polarized interpretations of morality, is a clear, and precise reflection of humanity's diverse perspectives, and experiences due to how complexly subjective human life is. It justifies, then reveals the malleable nature of ethical reasoning which challenges the notion of universal standards of the human general perspective. Inasmuch, the more acceptable essence of morality lies not in its rigidity, but in its capacity to adapt to the complexities of human existence, allowing every individual to navigate their personal realities while coexisting within a broader societal framework for themselves.

[7] Although the nature of death is always apparent to be acquired by any living thing, the concept of its circumstance holds a burdening thought to most who figured enough the whole ordeal behind it (as they commonly consider it, even in generality—no ordeal can be involved with death except for unresolved cases required with presence of the being.) Grieving is a sign of glorification, with denial of this circumstance serves as a right response for a human on its paradoxical encounters of critical thinking. Just as how abundant a human's mind was thwarted by a contemplative manner after a certain knowledge, the more it becomes keen to precision, and greatness of all. Yet a grand amount of agitation for one to manage keeps an underscoring of mental instability, and the insistent significance behind the occurrence, leaving some permanently thwarted for life. In struggling situations, one learns the reason to overcome the ordeal, and justify the means of living out of it. In most cases, death is the largest struggle any person has to overcome, with the means of transcending into unknown enigmas humanity is yet to profoundly discover (in a philosophical position, rather than scientific.) The blankness, the lacking provision, or the uncertainty death procures to our knowledge gives the recurring fear of the unknown by humans, that so called a "rational animal". With such fear, manifests an essence of integrity to disrupt one's absolute comprehension of the concept, striking implosion within the understanding, and an urge to discover more, which death offers nothing more to the bearer, mostly the perceivers. Death, just as a paradoxical certainty, endlessly continues to evoke existential contemplation of those who do not perceive it yet, and emotional conflict for their mental crises. It is such interplay of fear, and acceptance that molds humanity's evolving relationship with the strange nature of mortality. By grappling with the sullen mysteries of death, humans are likely compelled to constantly redefine their purpose, create significant meanings, and embrace the transient nature of life itself. The relentless pursuit of mere understanding, though often futile, underscores the resilience of the human spirit in its quest for significance amidst the void of the unknown.

[8] It is highly inevitable for a human to think without the corresponding opposition of a basic thought, thus it may possibly be also inconclusive to discover an element without its oppositional correspondence. Truth be told how contradictory thoughts make sense more than the simplest forms of words told by the feeble-minded. We've come far to aim to prove the simple things are superior than the complex ones, though not in terms of depth between the two, the latter is far more significantly better. While the nature of contradictions is seemingly chaotic, it is the cornerstone of intellectual

progress for discovery, challenging preconceived notions, and amplifying deeper understanding of a certain complex concept such as Morality. The complexity and hardships behind the comprehension for oppositional thought allows for nuanced perspectives, pushing the intellectual boundaries of human reasoning, gaining irrationality. This conclusive interplay between contradictions, and resolutions that humanity finds its capacity to question, innovate, and grow beyond the constraints of simplicity, embracing the profound beauty of intellectual hardships beyond capacities unable for extreme understanding.

[9] Everything required to be reasoned out is a staple for the satisfaction of a human's full comprehension of an element existing in our world. If something manifests to become unreasonable, the human mind creates unimaginable depths into making correlation with an uncorrelated reason to the element itself, for it to be rational, or so we consider "irrationality". In circumstances both ways don't satisfy human comprehension, good faith on unreasonable considerations could simply be the last resort, hence a religious belief that most rational beings seek to pursue in a lifelong journey of living. It could be defined that morality as a concept wasn't particularly developed by religious beliefs, and integrations. So much so that it had manifested from the grounds of ancient individuals who primarily sought an ethical approach to living, as a mere correspondence to practicality prioritizing reproduction, having an abundance, or a healthy society with more individuals learning to provide more resources to a growing population. It wouldn't be determined how morality was precisely discovered, succeeding to be integrated by every rational being, although it might be grasped how reasonably non-hostile pursue an ethical approach which leads to absolute safeguard of those affected by this pursuit. The urge of human inclination to rationalize even the irrational reveals an equivalence of desire for coherence, and definition. This tendency underlies the adaptability of the powerful human mind, as it seeks to construct frameworks that reconcile ambiguity with understanding just as what faithful living religious devotees integrate, for answering the unknown. While morality’s origins may still remain enigmatic, its practical application demonstrates humanity's capacity for cooperation and empathy, ensuring the preservation of societal harmony. By transcending primal instincts and fostering ethical interactions, morality becomes a testament to the evolutionary ingenuity of humanity.

[10] Hesitant traits of individuals who employed themselves the nature of general morality in a sense of obeying in accordance with legal considerations is a far enough proof for justifying weakness amongst the masses. Hindering the natural predatory traits, a human originally acquired from birth. Inasmuch to the integration of morality worldwide for centuries, we've come across possibilities that the strong influence of religious faith led mankind into this fixed viewpoint, regardless of the personal ambiguities it can assert to every individual. On the contrary to the central point of the sixth paragraph, we can suppose how commonly judged, and determined morality is by stating obvious cases to pique their responses falling in one specific same answer. Killing a person for unreasonable considerations is considered low on the spectrum of moral compass, determined as a non-ideal act to be done by any person, yet it could be justified if done by non-human beings. The hesitance of individuals to fully embrace moral imperatives rooted in legality, or religion reflects an ongoing struggle between

innate instincts, and societal expectations, improving the sense of skepticism towards an unresolved idea. Just as tension serves as a mirror of human duality, where the primal coexists with the cultivated. It raises questions about the long-term implications of suppressing natural instincts for collective benefit, challenging humanity to reexamine the ethical constructs that govern behavior. Through these speculative contemplations, the concept of morality evolves, continuously shaped by the interconnectedness between tradition, logic, and the enduring complexities of human nature.

## II. Authority of Powerlessness

The judgement of my unyielding dialogue already serves a purpose of it being enough for an introductory yapping of what the world is there to offer for every individual to be known. And let it be known what's here offers more extensive drama that will be provided authentically. Just to make sense, and more sensible than enough required me to provide a clear, yet shallow overview of the hurdling contents of this work, though it may sound very inartistic due to the ease of it for general comprehension. I don't intend to write in a gay manner, striving for straightforward statements. Below can be seen a compilation of questions yet to be answered objectively, though my foolish attempts may either cause large contributions to the development of the correct answers, or a dangerous distraction for those who thought it must make sense, and be reasonable enough.

[11] Here I propose to consider answering, or mainly justifying the rationale "Why consider others, when I must only consider myself in life?" as a form of ethical offense towards general morality. Although I don't necessarily aim to sound provocative, yet I'm aware that it would be inevitable in this case (just as every section this work has.) To justify such reasonable rationale is to challenge the very foundation of human interconnectedness, which morality solely aims to uphold for eternity. While self-interest is a natural instinct, and desire for self-attained benefit, it often contradicts the social contract that binds individuals into cooperative existence with identical pursuits. The offense lies not merely in the question itself but in the denial of humanity’s interdependent nature, where the collective welfare often determines the individual’s survival and flourishing.

[12] It is said to be mindful enough, and enterprise kindness for altruistic means to promote a better aspect of personal traits for other individuals to be influenced with, regardless of its clear signs of meekness, and inferiority. Underlining the layers of kindness, in most purposes of integrating this attitude is a form of assuring reciprocation from another party who receives it, yet we're still perplexed enough to wonder why humans tend to consider kindness as a staple to be experienced from another? Rather than seeking better qualities, improving, then creating another value developed by kindness. The alluring concept of such is the central part of tempting every individual to develop this trait as well for the sake of harboring the presence of itself, as a form of yielding from danger, regardless of their capacity of comprehension through human behaviour. Although kindness is often perceived as an altruistic virtue, it operates within a nuanced framework of notions towards social exchange. It subtly reinforces separated bonds, ensuring the giver, and receiver maintain a cycle of mutual benefit, even if

subconsciously. The ethical beauty of kindness lies in its duality—while it may stem from a desire for absolute reciprocation, it simultaneously cultivates misled trust, and unsure solidarity, becoming a staple of ethical relationships in human societies.

[13] As social animals, we're concluding bases on natures we're never entirely conclusive enough, yet surrounded by the manifestation of assurance by further rationalizing the thought behind. Even the most arbitrary concepts, we tend to rely on seeking patterns of these randomized functions, aiming for a common ground for its occurrence, judging whether it is to be experienced, or avoided at all conserved costs. In the name of social conduct which morality has denominated, gathering traits to be determined of their likeness, and improving the quality of human life is a consideration for permanent integration, regardless of how detrimental it should be, or beneficial to a set of those who are involved in this party. The human independent tendency to rationalize social patterns within a conserved set of practices underlines the critical need for order amidst uncertainty of reason behind it. Morality itself, as a widespread social construct, channels this need into actionable, and practicable traits, such as common kindness for others, that promote cohesion of intent, with the stability of it. While not all moral traits benefit every individual equally, their integration ensures additional perks for survival of the group, or an individual, creating a strong foundation upon which civilizations are constantly built, and sustained.

[14] The lack of kindness integrated by an individual towards others is a form of selfishness. The richness of such, is a foul consideration for disobedience to a sterilized moral compass we all pointlessly conform to. Serving the right judgment of undeserving life for a person who sees such behaviour as fit as it should be (for the consideration of their perception.) Proposing clearness within the intentions of one's purpose of acting a mere play, leaves a hasty advantage for the views of other individuals to seek so-called "Proper judgment" towards the intent. Partial absence of kindness, viewed through the misunderstood lens of selfishness, implies a stark deviation from the collective moral compass we've all known. Yet, this deviation also offers insight into the complexities of typical moral behavior, exposing the mental tensions between personal autonomy, and societal expectations. It is this interconnectivity that demands deeper reflection, challenging individuals to navigate the intricate balance of self-interest, and communal responsibility without succumbing to rigid moral absolutes.

[15] Yet one may think easily that integrating selfishness doesn't leave out the pursuit of kindness towards others, it certainly only holds into a priority of one's self. Whilst the lack of kindness, even the entire absence of it is a deliberate form of selfishness itself. This asymmetrical dependency is a representation of how unnervingly confusing, with a few amounts of perplexity this whole ordeal is, for no one to "objectively" respond to. When purely juxtaposed with kindness, it unveils an inherent paradox as it prioritizes the whole self, yet indirectly affects others for their own concern of their only self. A dynamic suggests that even self-centered actions ripple outward, influencing broader moral ecosystems. Even the absence of kindness amplifies a greater effect on the living of humanity due to the unusual traits it may offer to be evaluated by other individuals.

[16] This does not necessarily impose a thought of considering selfishness as a method of overcoming the shackles of morality, yet I surely emphasize the shackles we've been living in a stagnantly eventuating way. I consider selfishness as a part of showing disobedience from the laws of morality (which mostly developed into legal laws by now of every nation this world has so far, highlighting the tremendous influence it had on the intellect of rational animals.) Selfishness is not introduced here as a path of chaos, but rather as a critical examination of the constraints placed upon humanity by the inherited structures of morality. It represents a refusal to conform to a stagnating cycle of obedience. However, this rebellion must be tempered with reflection, lest it undermine the societal balance carefully upheld through collective intellect and shared values.

[17] It is unreasonable to kill, cheat, rob, or condemn—yet is it reasonable enough to be concerned for the rights, and will of others to live their lives to the fullest? Nothing is enough as a reason for someone to consider killing another, regardless of the breadth of the conflict, nor to pursue further acts. This discouragement isn't a form of conforming to morality, but to disclose benefits for others, by harrowing purposes for yourself. To kill, to cheat, to rob for such acts are universally denounced as humanely unreasonable, yet so too is the notion of living solely for the benefit of others. These prohibitions, though often framed within moral language, are practical safeguards ensuring societal stability. They are not about conforming but about protecting the equilibrium that enables individuals and communities to coexist.

[18] Regardless of my disclosure with such intent surrounding this whole question, for pursuit, it may likely still be misinterpreted as a form of encouragement towards a different kind of pursuit, closely similar to my own assertion, though I shall take accountability for the detrimental outcomes this may occur to a person who attempts to comprehend. In a method of reminding the mis-interpreter for their liabilities, in short... A guilt trip. Every assertion, no matter how carefully constructed, risks being misinterpreted through the lens of another's perspective. While I do not intend to encourage harm or disruption, I accept that such outcomes may arise. Accountability, however, should not rest solely with the originator of an idea. The interpreter also bears responsibility for their actions and choices.

[19] Altruistic means could not be considered as an element of the essence behind weakness, yet it serves a valuable tendency for such a person who attained this attribute. For dismissal of this attitude may solely be in accordance to one's personal benefits, as a fully-progressing being. The determination of weakness within one's essence of being (commonly named "personalities") might not be articulately, and accurately judged, merely only for their meekness, in a manner of developing an indoctrinated dogmatic viewpoint in life, leading into religious faith, or surviving with the reliance for irrationality. Altruism cannot be reduced to weakness; instead, it serves as a demonstration of strength through sacrifice for the collective good. To dismiss this trait as inferior is to disregard its essential role in fostering social progress. However, those who forgo altruism in favor of personal advancement reflect another factor of human development as the pursuit of individual excellence, which can coexist with, but not entirely replace, communal responsibility.

[20] In terms of the aspect regarding religious beliefs, and faith itself on a certain dogma, just as Nietzsche had famously claimed... Weakness was once introduced, cultivated, and perseveringly integrated for ages up until his age of disillusionment, in various forms romanticizing it, yet with the aim to destroy it, or conceal the essence of it, by fundamental elements of gratitude, meekness, faith, and compassion, or the systematic parts of weakness itself.

[21] The will to power is an option-less method of escaping realism behind the shackles of integrating weakness through numerous platforms of integration. Although the "will" itself comes as a reward for a weakling persevering the down-going trait to overcome struggle. In extensive search for the will, one must perish firstly from the viewpoint of pursuing meaninglessness of despite, and consider a structural approach to pursue life as purposeful, despite the randomness of living, with the additional suffering within it.

[22] In all honesty without denial, cultivation of morality is a scheme for the altruistic means, with a tendency to provide altruism, falling into the quicksand of weakness, suffering for inferiority. And such presumptions may serve a lack of advantage within the realm of one's own content living, promoting justified disadvantages, circled through millennia. Religion's role into stuffing up our fragile airheads with full of complex assertions leave constant suppression of our minds, into a conformation of morality's laws as it proposes improvement for the quality of life of everyone in a humane, and equal way depending on the degree a person abides to these in unbounded laws.

[23] It does not clearly determine the advantages of a non-moral person, though it serves them a specific essence, and definition of freedom which is a universal consideration of a huge advantage for a being, in the animal kingdom... This isn't an uncommon phenomenon. Every wildlife roam for their survival, avoiding various improvements on certain aspects which humans had conceptualized upon for the subject to concentrate whilst living. As animals aren't advised to live in a life where they are merely concerned for other species, even their own kind, but their blood, and flesh, for it don't necessarily make their own living better, but rather lacking of superiority by spreading their potential forces widely onto unnecessary ruling of what they must live for, providing a lack of focus onto a field they excel wholly.

[24] In the formation of synthesizing my thought, I can already tell how unoriginal it certainly is, which had already been attributed to Nietzsche's ideas a few centuries earlier, though I am here to provide an additional point in contribution to Nietzsche's critique of religion, Christianity specifically. As can be read below, it states clearly the degree of justification Nietzsche proposed to prove a point which I had given an overview on the previous sections:

"Christianity has taken the side of everything weak, base, ill-constituted, it has made an ideal out of opposition to the preservative instincts of strong life; it has corrupted the reason even of the healthiest natures by teaching men to regard the supreme values of spiritual strength as something sinful, as something leading to

damnation, as a temptation." Friedrich Nietzsche, Beyond Good and Evil, Part V: "The Natural History of Morals," Section 201

[25] Learning selfishness, and the virtues of other denominations of such can be a truly essential improvement for the well-being of an individual as they intend personal discourse only to live for the benefit of themselves without the thought for others, unless if they are related in a familial, or romantic way, yet still with these two considerations, it may underscore disadvantageous quality of living for the person due to the divided attention, and dedication for the betterment of others for both benefits.

[26] It doesn't necessarily state disobedience if a person pursues selfishness, though in a personal viewpoint, it can be very challenging for the pursuer to maintain this closeted mindset.

## III. The Fear of Pursuit

[27] A couple may still highlight their assumptions that morality is an objective law to divide what shall be done, and what must not, yet varying in other ways of understanding the morals behind actions which cannot be possible to justify the former thought of its objectivity. It would certainly be surprising for a critical thought to consider how merely an illusion morality is for us to transcend insincerely, with the method not in accordance with natural progress of improvement, and maintenance. What knowledge do I hold for the outcome of a natural improvement of humanity? No suburban person will have an idea, for the reason of the widespread integration of a different transcendence, unless of their vast knowledge of indigenous individuals who lives in so-called "Neanderthal" living, or something that are commonly considered to be a non-modern type of living which includes tribal environments from obscure parts of the world.

[28] In great observation of the method these folks are living, I can determine the superiority of their kind for the reason of declining what was ingrained in every man's thought, morality. Serving as a forceful way of going on the path of naturalistic living, these individuals are solely developing the betterment of not only themselves, other of their kinds, but to where they live, without massive destruction of it by developing short-term opportunities given to temporary circumstances. Unlike these indigenous individuals, I could shamefully admit their impressive preservation ways to maintain the nature of earth just as it was before, and will shift for centuries to another form, as more species are left to evolve and roam earth after millennia.

[29] In radical aspects of Neanderthals, and modern tribal living, with the conservation of pursuing as such can be quite a painful experience for a typical suburban life with a perfect amount of grasp on morality (which could be the slightest minimum), as an integrated concrete social construct. For it defies moral laws, with the only objective to strive for pure survival of oneself, and their relatives (family). Without further consideration for pursuing more Morality-inclined practices which is a perceived weakness for every individual who had a mind of a Neanderthal. There exist cast civilizations of various tribes which constructed a distinct version of natural living for humans, as it particularly maintains the longevity of the civilization in unethical

forms of eating one another as form of traditions, and constant necessity, or hunting living species, and further ancient practices, no different than a pack of animals conserving the well-being of their leaders, and themselves without sense of unnecessary forms of compassion towards one another. Although one may wonder why these individuals seek to have major concerns on their leaders. That is solely to prevent internal danger for themselves, sparking conflicts within the organization, and for a belief which shows how reliable their leaders can be to provide what's necessary for everyone (in methods the people themselves work for, only to be praised, and unjustly acknowledged towards their leader. Closely similar to a reliance on a God, which humans had made to seek comfort, perfection, and an avoidance of uncalled danger.)

[30] Simply put, the life of a thinking individual can always be full of contradictory viewpoints, and illusions to compel themselves towards some things, and a set of actions they didn't desire at all. Even with the absence of Morality's contribution to a set of actions, it can still be detrimental to form a whole firm logical-based plurality of practices as a life response for a lifetime. In a nature where every complexity has its own unanswered sections meant to be discovered in certain moments, which logic itself will never accomplish to understand, and simply manipulated in accordance to one's desire of appreciation. Although Morality had already been fixed to a point where it largely affects a series of actions which manifests an outcome otherwise to what was anticipated, or desired by the perceiver. I don't mean to put all favour to one's desire, as it will destroy the transcendental potential of humanity more than any sort of disadvantageous effects human concepts had created, but merely a concentration in favour of philosophizing the constant need of every individual, in the least value, with prevention of unnecessary abundance for the undeserved, though not an equal compensation for every individual (as I should simply just discuss Marxism if I strive to provide this type of ideology.)

## IV. The Pursuit in Reliance to the Flaw

[31] As words hardly explain a set of consciousness behind a person's idea, or point due to barriers of the mind full comprehension of their own idea, or the inability to speak articulately in a proper sense (which is a weak disadvantage for a person who must provide their insights for the benefit of every individual), I attempt to state my own in simplest terms I could employ.

[32] I will state a full admission that this type of pursuit will never be able to be integrated for the masses due to the outcomes of the influence of morality setting legal laws to restrict unethical views, and practices for mere survival, and transcendental purposes. I can certainly confess the uselessness of this whole work, that never provided any major contribution, and insights to seek the epitome of a human consciousness, only because it stays as a sole thought, and only a thought that can never be accomplished no more. We could try to conceptualize disregarding the existence of legal laws of human civilization, and start back in the age where even languages are poorly produced to be spoken. Yet it may not proceed us to ensure integrating moral-less practices, for the aim of transcendence, and survival of our kind. Due to the rapid development of Morality's concept, even the most imbecilic individuals can simply have the perfect

grasp of it despite its sheer complexity. The psychological factor of perceiving your environment full of individuals who do the exact same practices, holds a special place in one's mind to replicate, wonder about, and fully acknowledge/accept the nature of these sets of practices, and behaviours. Which simply indicates the impossibility of my entire argument, leaving my own frustrated mindless, substance-less, and shallowness thought to go to waste.

I am deeply upset for the failure of my argument to be perfectly pursued, though I could imagine Nietzsche's mental relation to my own, due to his inability to see the epitome of his Übermensch which is a tamely unrealistic concept to consider (with my own having the same level, or even higher of delusion compared to his.) It was still a wonderful acceptance of my failure to provide deeper, healthier, and morality-friendly insights which yielded in favour of the concept, with my confession for the downfall of my offense against a complex, and properly defended idea.

# God Never Created Evil... We Did!

This is clearly a satirical, and humorous argument that entertains the entire existence of a deity, which is generally called "God". This collection of jottings of such hilarious ideas has been added for the sake of providing a tiny essence of fun, and playful side of the work.

There has been a circulating argument between atheists, and Christians regarding a particular topic, being left unanswered in the most definitive way from both parties, leaving them baffled in the end of a funny discourse., and it's all about the atheists giving offense to the Christians with the mindboggling question(s) "If God truly exists, how come it couldn't stop the revolution of Evil in humanity?", "If Evil exists, and God can't remove it completely, it does prove that God isn't really omnipotent, isn't it?", "If God didn't expect that evil would generate such an immense amount of negativity towards humanity, Doesn't that already prove that God isn't really Omniscient?", and other more similar arguments., and I beg to disagree from this standpoint, and inferior inquiry of atheists. I don't really think that God have created evil in particular to be cultivated by humanity, and ruin our world by the power of it., and every aspect of evil, and the actions, or practices being classified as "evil" is a natural cycle of human's consciousness, simply like any other animals out there. Evil doesn't really even exist if we take a close look in a practical, and/or logical sense. As I claim, God has created us equally classified as animals as well, with unique attributes, and similarities with other species, but in our case—we have contracted a very advantageous, and transcendental trait of having our own languages, ability to speak, and ability to create way better than natural creations of spiders, and other species that are known of creating habitats for themselves. We were made as no exception to the nature of every single animal, but our unique attribute had given us the opportunity to strive away from it, and become more evolutionary. From being the distant cousins of chimpanzees, we have acquired the ability to cooperate with ourselves in a unique way that no other animal can replicate (by this claim, I don't mean that every other species of animal out there is incapable of cooperating with their fellow species.) Humans had the capability to build civilizations, generate economies, and governments that lead the entirety of the human race globally. But only a few recalls what our ancestors used to do, in ancient times. We hunt animals by spearing, and chopping them up for the purpose of food, and clothing. We have been doing sexual intercourse(s) anywhere without the shame of being seen by other people. We literally have no sense of moral compass, and standards that everything we do belongs to the grey area between good, and evil, making it simply beyond both spectrums, all because of the motivation of our own unconscious required actions by love, and desire itself for the sake of sustaining our lives, and proceed on reproducing more humans. Not a single particular animal species has moral standards nor awareness to ethical framework of behavior, except humans who conceptualized it from the aristocratic hierarchies, with the help of the slaves, enterprising the opposition of both moralities' centuries ago. In that case, other species can certainly be taught with moral discipline through extensive guidance of a human being who urges to teaches them such, but those animals don't have the same deep perceptions as humans, and their only basis of their learnings is the concept of "do", or "don't" without the judgment of their actions, and decisions being bad, or good.

The mere absence of morality has always been stagnant for centuries, and never had the time where it needs the Conceptualization from the people who brilliantly thought, and implemented it. We can't blame a deity with an uncertain plausibility of existence to be the creator of it, much rather the perpetrator of the conception of evil that can never be stopped as it has already infiltrated the minds of every human being, and most likely will never be eradicated by any possible method. But in the argument of God's omniscience, the atheist's argument might actually be a refutation of this whole argument. Which I'll have to admit that they could actually be right. Allow me to explain in my flawed personal claims (with the right amount as religion, and atheism.) Christians (be aware that I will mainly focus on this specific religion for the sake of prevention from broad arguments involving other parties which are quite irrelevant to this argument alone), have been in the sanctuary of knowledge revolving God as the perfect being that had ever existed, in every single positive aspect that anyone could imagine. From being the most forgiving, to kindest, to most generous, and many more, Christians have been blinded by this concept of perfection even if they're aware that it isn't totally possible to even fathom. It's not a surprise to see Christians having blinded faith in an unexplainable rationale, aiming to believe in every aspect of impossibility in the probability of the world. It's also never too surprising to realize their misconceptions regarding God itself, for being perfect. Just as every other being, even God itself is imperfect, but only in a human perspective for the reason that we have created unfathomable amount of concepts, and ideas surrounding ourselves, learning more, and gathering truths as much as possible, but this only falls down in our pedestal, and scope. Supporting my first claim, we have lived in a default simulator just as every other animal species, and we just evolved because of our unique capabilities, but that can never be applied to everywhere, even God itself. God has no morals, God isn't aware of epistemology, nor ethics, nor psychology, etcetera., and with that, God abides only by its own rules, and desires which we've obliged to find out about, whether it desires us humans to potentially end our own race, or to destroy the world, it's always only up for God itself, and what it wants. But as we're indoctrinated by moral compass, and no one is left behind, we can't deny the dogmatism we typically live as humans, regardless of our religion, race, sexuality, etcetera. We are deluded to strict obedience of morality, ruining the essence of the authenticity of human nature itself, a species no different from any other animal. Just as mentioned as well, I'm saddened by the fact that humans have standardized evil as an animalistic behaviour as if it's substantial to our nature. Yet almost no one seems to realize that we always act like animals as well in various aspects but we're blinded by the "so-called default" acts we are used to, and choose to cherry pick just certain situations for the emphasis, and acknowledgement of animalistic behaviour.

Atheists usually get crazy if an ignorant Christian couldn't answer their "smart" inquiries. Without considering any of the principles I've stated, and I'm sure that it would baffle any atheist, and Christian out there with the sensibility of my claims, but even so... I don't recommend anyone to rely completely on this argument, as it's solely just an argument, and nothing else. Take it as a grain of salt as much as possible, but reconsider, and think about the logic behind my words as well, without getting obsessed with it. We're used to having like-minded perspectives that if one tolerates "evil" doings, and malfeasances, they are evil as well. Without ever disregarding morality itself, and

questioning why everyone always base their own decisions to morality as if it's something necessary in life to begin with. Unfortunately, in our current world where political laws have been implemented globally, morality manipulates the entirety of it, and will most likely never exist without the malicious intent of manifestation of morality by aristocracy, or the higher ups, leaving us all with no choice but to abide the laws of morality's spectrum to be capable of being a lawful individual. I'm not saying that it doesn't really matter to follow morality in case there's no actual laws restricting us from doing so. But rather I try to emphasize, and recognize the inessential revolution, and integration of morality in human race, even sometimes gradually affecting, and merely controlling other certain animals other than us (commonly those pet-perceived specific species like dogs.) Obedience to morality is never essential in dog's nature, as well as in human nature, but we have been plagued long enough to make it unstoppably contagious, thus also causing it to be uncontrollable because it's the concept which controls, and manipulates us. In concluding this, anyone might tell how powerful influence, words, and manipulation may actually be to have authority over humanity. This applies not only to Morality itself, but to various large conceptions as well like Religion, Politics, and Social Conduct. The mere unimportance of each factor I've mentioned is viable, yet no one will most likely ever disregard their existence as they have become labeled as "essential to humanity" in this day, and age.

# Positivism for the Exemplary

Despair in the revolution of classless anomalies done by craving enthusiasts of mass corruption certainly underline the commonality in our society's legacy of existence where partial grievances from the majority understands the flaws of such anomalies, with such discovers the sense of their capability to withstand the test of evil, and move astray from this, although I do not precisely say that this is an ideal track to abide in following for the rest of one's lifetime. We defend the objective truth when it deemed a particular topical objection towards a particular sense of existence, to put simpler; we are bound to revolve in a cyclical consideration for similar entities, due to commonalities which constitute the same conclusion as another set of assumptions which shape the flaws of practical human thought, and the limits it preserves to be proven as something constant, and stagnant. In a typical sense, we are compelled to have the capabilities of having "freedom of thought", without the justification of the essence behind this particular freedom, or thus I say "something lacking towards inconclusiveness". We are set to achieve humanistic means to narrow the unknowable factors which involve our own means, and existence, in a moral, psychological, and physical sense. Yet we are always bound to attain particular sets of conclusions which help no further for these transcendental capabilities that allow improbability, and the lack of uncertainty in essences we are yet to comprehend with our capabilities. Playing in a large part of this way of worldviews, and collective viewpoint is the means to distinguish the objective morality which we are set to abide, in major cases this is still unknowable, and will not be determined sooner based on the stagnancy of human cognition to take advantage of our mental capabilities to put into use. We pollute the means of justification towards shelling out further dissection, and scrutiny with regards to playing against incompletion. troubling the causes for initial progression, being in favor of unnatural hindrance to be worked upon the manifestation of lesser feasibility. Minding our own falsification of congruent aspects in developing plain objective order for adherence with our moral compasses, we define such to be in a fixed articulation. Indicating the attribution of lowering the case for absolute certainty towards the act of progress, falsifies the crippling hope for further application of practical development, and absolution. Ideally, we share the same concluding statement to abide as typical beings in full adherence, understanding, and composure towards our collective moral compass, and that simply is to avoid evil-doings, and pursue goodness as a virtue of epitomizing perfection. Yet to uphold the recurring problem within this aside from the specific ones I've discussed about previously on my epistemological critiques, I bring the classification for scrutiny of further declaration as a response to the main problem of this section; the problem of taking advantages of our collective moral compass, as a factor for the inner evil. We tend to fascinate ourselves with the nature of psychological manipulation between every aspect of another existence to another. It is a nature we deem to develop frameworks, and intellectual exhaustion to decipher the ideation behind it. Just as we are condemned by attributing ourselves with the thought of it, much worse is to apply it towards another person regardless of the means for the attempt, whether with ill intent, or a simple trial. Although condemned by humanity, and despised in nature, humanity fails to seek enlightenment to be well-versed, and potentially detect this kind of behavioral difference compared to a normal person without any practical desire of applying manipulation. It is an advantageous, and

commonly pursued ill-intent of humanity to have set to achieve their mere personal goals, in ways condemnable by the mass of people. in relation to the presence of power above something deemed as smaller, or weaker; manipulation is a recipe for success, in attaining loyalty, truthfulness, or maintenance of the power the person currently possesses. The reason I am involved to discuss the idea of manipulation is the major involvement of such in cases about the humanistic system's inadequacy, for thus I pertain to deliver the dissection in a clearest structure to enlighten the massive argument behind the sources of this particular nature, and power's relations with it.

No ill intent requires the wills non-reliant in seeking power above something to execute a belief of authority towards another being, whether it is another human, or a different kind. All of those intentions are driven with one purpose always in mind, and that's to seek the validation to be capable of having authority. The concept of power baffles the worldview of man, which preserves the thought which humanity itself kept themselves preoccupied with identifying the underlying factors, that will eventually disengage from confusion, in a sense of having clearer definition of the conceptual value, and means it implies. In the process of gaining power, it includes within the progression the sole yielding of manipulation, whether in various forms, or in different strategies that reflects the succession of the pursuit. With regards to manipulation, it is indefinite for the act of manipulation to be classified as such, and to consider the ill intents behind it, where we are deemed to maintain our notion that we are yet to discover another set of mundane actions, without malice, in failure of the necessary cognitive identification. Even with proper adherence to scrutinize a behavioral act, does not provide enough circumstantial evidence, or realization that considers their acts as something manipulative, having some sort of manifestation for a different anticipated conclusion to be followed upon. In such, we are not to be blamed for this kind of circumstances of which is fairly inevitable, and situational to the causes of one's initial decisions with their thought, and actions. Situations, entities, and things are commonly unprecedented, and pertained as incongruence beyond reasonable linearity. The act of manipulation itself procures the main factor; it serves as a behavior; to manipulate every existence, even the deluded bearer of it. The woeful does not implement the act completely, but they subject themselves into the depths of it. One which subjects themselves is a form of liberation from a social norm, which categorizes the act of mercy as a justification for another set of virtues to be considered. It justifies itself to deliver a sensation of unconventional approaches in life where the mass is fearful to even have a thought of it in any situational attribution of consequential causes of acting upon something that seeks validity, and comprehensive pretense. One certain thing is the sudden reduction of consideration for constant manipulation as a threat to mankind being a force of human nature as a form of taking advantage of the cognitive function that complies with numerous amounts of mental malleability, and the depths it can function for. There is a societal suppression that convolutes the particular set of behaviors, and mentalities which the authority begins to procure, and implement for the people below them, this ideally is already a form of forced manipulation. As to how it functions centuries after it was constantly done, is because of the manifested series of consequences for those who wish, or even thought of disobeying it. The government is a major indicator for the effectiveness of this act to be used, and shows all the grey areas that we are undetermined for centuries as to whether it is morally wrong, or reasonably

correct. Whether it must be pursued is a constant probing of our own morales' accuracy, and determining adherence to the generality. In the sense of unintentional manipulation towards another particular person, or entities, we necessarily do not indicate ourselves to be blamed for it, although it requires a sense of acknowledgement, recognition to the flaw, and careful avoidance of the sort, in this case we are the composite scapegoats of our own accountabilities (of in such case, are non-existent, inconclusive, and far-fetched.) Once we have got the instances to discover our own escapades in situations unheard of our perceptions, recollection of memory begins to sour, as it convolutes, and vanishes into another set of nonlinear cognition. As we determine the force of nature that judges our personal decisions, and confide authority above it, we are led to strive for the betterment of the causes of which justifies the same reason as another natural perception of a person. In one's own perception, we are our own narcissistic endeavors to ourselves which comply with the basis of the act of manipulation, and the desire for it to be continuously performed. This unending phenomenon occurs as a process of standard living to every individual regarding their worldviews, and underlying factorial aspects which suspect certain suspicions, and assumptions to natural responses done by human cognition. With the circumstance of being manipulated however, attribute us to lead ourselves astray from the path of being manipulated by an outsource beyond our own comprehension, and capability of avoidance. We are yet to discover the sense of relieving constancy from despair against the occurrence of experiencing manipulation done by another being, and thus complicates the trampling to this kind of situation. I can bravely state that with regards to the foundational discourse which concludes the thought that manipulation is good, in aspects major to the faces of human nature. Which among the depths of the lowly, prevails as another form of misconception, and harrowing manifestation, on the verge of destroying their own well-being, or moral compass for the reason of mental jeopardy. Although circumstantial, it is much-awaited for the people to have realizations with regards to their own misalignment of moral pursuits, and actions, that simply distorts the clarity between the distinction of manipulation with genuine sense of reliability to the person of whom they seek actions from. There is a depth of confirming a gradual linearity of distinguishing, rather than identifying, further, one that identifies are committed to gain knowledge every detail of something, whilst distinguishing gets to differentiate particular subjects between themselves, and have grasp on the corners of every detail that may be classified as different things from either provocative, inductive, deductive, or other circumstantial imposition of the factor. Confirming the addressing of this kind of problem relies on the sudden change of facts which depend on the degree of identification, and distinction of the phenomenon, or act itself imposed on others. Newly acquired senses with identifying the factors of manipulating people are served by ill intents of which are in incorporated by certain deeper reasons, and prolonged periods of experiences proceeding to another set of worldviews which constitute the main struggle of a mind of the person, or something that hinders their capabilities to execute their method, and preference of living. All factors in play for manipulation, even excluding the ill intent driven ones, are solely intrapersonal contractions of their own unfavourable decisions against the desire of being in favour. One that wonders complies with the force of nature that makes it worth for discovery, and interpretation.

With regards to the common exercise of the degree of belief, and instruction of an authoritative nature, there seems to be some particular heaviness of reliance upon authority that of which emerges not just merely as a social construction, but also as a psychological conviction founded on hierarchical validation, and the worldview of the authoritative nature of mankind to be followed by a herd of deemed inferiors. Focusing on the mind (in its ordinary structure), is gradually inclined toward the unjust recognition of superiority as an implicit marker of the existence, or essence which truth resides in, even when the substance of such truth is identical to that articulated by an equal who determined themselves as somewhat lower in different aspects compared to the authority. Considering the presence of an authoritative figure, despite whether one invested with political, or institutional rank, perhaps experience, or perceived intellectual eminence with immersion, these acts to be the basis of a stabilizing principle of objective certainty as we currently know it, pacifying the otherwise restless conditions of self-determination through intellectual doubt that continuously prevail in horizontal exchanges of knowledge in the basis of acknowledgement, and recognition. When a particular colleague of equal standing proposes a fact in terms of propositional considerations without the lack of evidence, and certainty on their behalf, the listener's consciousness instinctively subjects it to the trial, and proposes their own form of skepticism, as the parity of status fails to generate the necessary distance for reverence, or epistemic submission without the sense of intermissive power. On the contrary, with the presence of authority, however, functions as a mediating force between the main insecurity of subjective understanding, the consistent lack of self-determination, and the external assurance of legitimacy given by another particular higher person. Its conductive power will not rest merely upon knowledge, but upon the symbolic structure of positional recognition, initially with an inherited trust that subordinate's truth to sudden prestige. With so, the exact articulation of a claim, when voiced by one vested with official or personal authority, acquires a gravity absent in its earlier, egalitarian utterance compared to a plebeian. It surely satisfies the individual's psychological demand for social, and mental order, for the comfort of believing under colonizing command, and for the moral simplicity of obedience to wisdom that appears greater than one's own. The main thing with such reliance is that it exposes a profound dependence on the hierarchy of our own unthoughtful validation generating an orientation of the intellect not towards truth itself, but towards the voice from which truth is presumed to emanate, disregarding the consideration of absolution. We prematurely assess the capabilities of our own cognition in terms of reliability of being a source of truth, and information, without the justification thereof, in whatever the truth strictly coexists with, as for the inclusion of the portioned objection, we are partly in blame for the ignorance we held up to disclose, and finalize a state of being, which procures the essence of truth itself to become a reliable sort. In an inferior thinking society, we are commonly associated with, it is no question for us to be adept in every form of mental articulation, and substitutionary contraction for inconclusiveness, and the preservation of the uncertain, as we are strictly convoluted with heights of disparity apart from each other's line of consequential influences, and occurrences led to propagation. Doomed to feel eternally unstored for greatness, and clearly indicative of one's own delusional expense, leading to an unsecured mind. In the midst of this recurrence, I assure the certainty that it is in no manner of degree of how a person is

believed to be less from danger, or despair than those who are deemed to be one as themselves, performing a single antithetical coexistence to each other suppresses the idea of possessing the essence of inequity, for thus requires imminent assertion of one's existence on the verge of humanistic accountabilities that are highly incongruent to the form of consciousness. What must be served, and those who serve relies on the same side of the coin with identical fate among all, with solely the difference of the frequency of such identical occurrences to happen in one. Those who had preemptively foretold their fate on the basis, and aspects of life as a sort of uncomplicated factor lacked the leash for the avoidance from imminent failure, and danger to their own means of living just as to seek for the entire means of such. What the circumstances may be, is the constant certainty that the person of a deemed simple case becomes the apparent bearer of a larger degree of uncertainty unprecedented to what was considered as something certain to them. There is a well-known manipulative tactic done by these individuals to not fall into the path of which they are deemed unfavorable, with such attempts, they go successful for it due to the unjustified failure of proper distinction, and cognition as a response to these manipulative attempts leading not merely just a circumstance of being fooled (in the perspective of the particular person manipulated), but become a fool as a whole society that were considered to have divided viewpoints, and personal distinctions from each other, in this case however, unites the entirety's flawed cognition making drastically catastrophic shifts on the basis of what simply are the ethical standards of our society as a whole, giving homage to the flawed collectivity of our ideation, and notions reflecting the side of what is to be recognized as something disadvantageous on our society's end. As for the process of searching the truth, we tend to dissect improperly, just as the means to attain ideal living, with such, it will be considered as flawed as well, not in some sort of non-impactful consequences, rather in a sort of something conventionally remarkable. One of whom strictly adheres to the laws of unnatural presumptions beyond the considerations of limiting proactively responding on the basis of fate, and its aspects, is a fully unaddressed limitations of which compresses mere inadequacy on the circumstances unidentified, and undetermined to the causes, and means of the person who perceives it. This constantly applies to those who are reliant on the basis of nature, but are just simply conducting presumptions that attempt to justify the means of believing without logical bases, and procurement

# AESTHETICAL DISCOURSES

# V

# Essence of Beauty, and Subjectivity in surrounding complexities (Prelude)

# Validation as Vindication

Expansion of mediocrity harrows the will of superior workers to become underwhelmed for their determination to persevere, as it is deemed by society how gradual acceptance of such low-quality works can never be a surprising phenomenon. The misconception of progress comes from failure, driving individuals with potential to strive for better into a path of lowliness, for it condemns them into a delusion which guarantees their greatness from countless amounts of failures which they weren't supposed to have been manifesting at all. We're glorified to embrace our imperfections, to maintain our level into such stagnancy which could simply be changed by mere improvement of perseverance, and the work itself. With the hopes for acceptance received by others mediocre, every other individual in the same field seeks for certain validation they witness being received by them, highlighting their incompetence, narcissism, and slyness.

Here's to briefly explain why this phenomenon was chosen to be an inevitable obstacle of human labour, and passion. For whichever reasons, it could usually include the thought of giving less effort to the table, for instilled appreciation to receive is a major factor. With some aiming to the extent of financial practicality reasons, to become advantageous, with less efforts given in fields revolving budgeting. The first motivation for this action is the perception of an individual towards another receiving praise, and validation enough to satisfy their urge to pursue this certain field of work, of which is a mere replication of other's actions, without the consideration of competency against one another, boosting another advantage for the individual being perceived as motivational in this case. The stagnant appreciation of oneself towards their work, without the flaming urge of reaching the highest of their own potential is a decreasing point to nowhere successful artistically, though largely capitalized for the benefit of finance only, leaving out the "passion" behind the purpose with the artistic action. Insofar to such consideration, one must be left with the tendencies to grasp more lower quality artistic ideas, concepts, and works (which can always be found subjective from anyone's perspective), highlighting the fact which I couldn't immerse myself into believing what must be a general sense of mediocrity, and what should be a superior one.

Though I can completely say how beneficial this phenomenon is to a typical human mind, for one to comprehend a portion of their own potential, and have a sight of whether they must pursue, or continue the passion of artistic endeavour. Precedent to believing is always disbelieving, whether by ignorance, justification of contradiction, or simple skepticism. In spite of every concrete degree of defense for an idea to be relied on, a disbelief was always present, either before, or after the moment of believing. In such cases, one is unable to believe a concept to work without immersing in the experience of it, which is very empirical, yet objectively justifiable. Not only could I find the flaws of this entire phenomenon, but some advantages for the artist. One being the assurance of pursuit without leaping their whole faith on reliance for desirable outcomes, without a waste of one's rational efforts to succeed, with a supporting determination from the primary pleasant experience received. Yet, by recognizing one's genuine talent, comes a self-appreciation of their own works, if having consistent

positive criticisms, reaping comfort. I wouldn't generalize this situation, for the reason of my perception of other artists underappreciating themselves regardless of the amount of commends they have gotten throughout the years of producing well-made pieces, their culminating point wouldn't exist until they slip into their own downfall, considering the peak of their recognition, and general validation as the tipping point of their own greatness, which had ended, and with never be achieved again. Does an artist's ultimate goal is to have "decent" productions, not seeking their own peak? A fraud does, whilst an authentic artist would always find the peak of their greatness until death, unlike a fraud which only concentrates for the financial incentives their lower quality productions would gather. A single critique may either clearly motivate the artist to polish their skillset to reach the best quality they could produce, or a finish line for one's assumed "delusion" of pursuit.

Financial gain is what would expose one for their true desires, and overall attitude within every aspect. And proving money for the mistaken minds would sear the narcissistic tendencies they have, to take advantage of their mediocrity with appreciation of tasteless individuals, boosting personal profit without giving out the same degree of effort compared to underappreciated artists. This is highly inevitable already due to the compliance of general's opinion of something "good" even for a mediocre work, justified by the universal rationale of "taste is subjective", and could never be objectively agreed on one general viewpoint, yet agreed by many, in contradictory to their own flawed argument of subjectivity, yet also paradoxical due to differences in certain small amount of disagreement. Admiringly, I could admit how smart one mediocre artist could become, for doing this, only for their own benefits, yet giving out false, or misleading benefits for the consumer by claiming the superiority of their own work, mixed with longevity of support by their long-time admirers (unless they're used to publish, or produce immensely high quality of works consistently, the general view may notice the sheer downfall of quality of one, satisfying the grave claims of it actually being too terrible compared to their previous releases.)

Criticism becomes merely unbearable. Even a single instance where the gentlest suggestion that they could improve, that their work lacks depth or originality, is met with sudden outrage as anticipated response, yet not to such a degree. To the narcissist, critique is never a tool for growth, but an attack on their very identity to destroy their personality. They see themselves as above reproach, as misunderstood geniuses whose brilliance is too vast for the average mind to comprehend. And so, they harshly dismiss, deflect, or lash out every kind of unpleasant response, framing themselves as victims of an unappreciative world. They would always rather be pitied than corrected, if one may have the capability to choose. In this environment, mediocrity flourishes. If enough people declare something to be great, it won't matter whether it actually is, or mostly not. The narcissist understands this phenomenon very well. They don’t need to be the best; they just need to convince enough people that they are in ways not in accordance with objectivity. Authenticity is unnecessary when perception is everything for a Narcissist mind. They hijack the language of struggle, of artistry, of perseverance, crafting a narrative where they are the misunderstood talent, the visionary ahead of their time. They wear hardship like a costume, knowing it makes their success seem more deserved.

Arguably true passion doesn’t behave this way in any form of similarity. Though Narcissism doesn’t allow for this mindset to even conquer, for it is very fragile, too desperate for immediate personal gratification, and mentally crucial for one's well-being. It seeks unacceptable shortcuts, easier certain wins, constant reinforcement of these practices, and the maintenance of all in a consistent manner without fail. It tends to avoid self-reflection for one's quality of creativity, for the fear of destructive self-criticism, since true self-awareness would mean admitting that perhaps, they aren’t as brilliant as they want to believe

One of the most disheartening realities is that some of them were not always this way in the beginning. Many began with genuine passion, and restless ambition, but somewhere along the curved journey, they became lost in the clamor of external validation even in the shallowest sense of consideration. They experienced fleeting praise, and mistook it for true fulfillment for the quality of their work, even if improvement must be integrated. They will seek to realize how effortless it would be to be celebrated for doing much less, for conforming to expectations rather than pushing themselves beyond their limits, with the fear of misunderstanding their own concept of work, and the standard of the general wouldn't match enough to their own. Once they settled into that validating comfort, returning to the arduous path of growth became unthinkable, and abandoned for bad. Within their minds, that "After all, progress is painful, and reinvention is exhausting." It is far easier to play the role of the revered artist than to undertake the relentless pursuit of true artistry, with the uncertainty of reaping the deserving recognition, and compensation meeting the expectations in return for the creation of the work.

Insofar, we could consider this as to why plenty of artists cease to improve, not because they have reached their culminating peak of artistry, but because they immensely fear confronting the possibility that they have not, and will never do, due to their anxiety behind as the largest factor for resistance to progress. To strive for more is to risk failure in itself, and savour the moral of the circumstances after a certain set of action, when triumph does not match. To greatly endure moments of complete silence where not a single applause is given, and no reassurances of commending brilliance are offered as a validation of one's quality of work. A narcissist must never afford such shackles of uncertainty. Thus, they tend to stagnate, endlessly recycling the same exact ideas, notions, formulas, and techniques that have proven successful in the past, yet needs reaffirmation of changes, and improvement. Meanwhile, their ignorant set of audience as it is conditioned to associate familiarity with absolute excellence which continues to offer guaranteeing praise for the justification of their stagnancy onto that one particular artistic behaviour.

Yet, beneath the flattened surface, there is an unmistakable hollowness within. Deep down, they understand that admiration built upon a fragile foundation is inherently unstable. Which is why they are never truly satisfied, as they perpetually seek more, and more validation, more recognition, more evidence of their large significance. However, no amount of external approval can ever suffice, for admiration without substance is like a meal that never satiates, a hunger that never fades even after an ingestion of nothingness, beheld.

Authentic excellence, in its most absurd and unyielding form, does not lower itself to the ceaseless hunger for recognition, for to do so would be to tether its essence to the fickle whims of an audience that knows neither the weight of creation nor the solitude of true endeavor. It does not wither beneath the gaze of critique, for critique itself is often but an echo of convention, a murmuring of those who demand familiarity and fear the jagged edges of the unknown. It does not submit to the intoxication of mass approval, which, like all transient indulgences, numbs rather than nourishes, pacifies rather than propels. The narcissist, however, clings desperately to the illusion of significance, fearing that without the eyes of the world fixed upon them, they might cease to exist at all. They weave a fragile identity out of the applause of those who admire not out of understanding, but out of habit, out of the comfort of seeing the same predictable patterns played out again and again. And so, they stagnate, repeating themselves in smaller and smaller circles, mistaking motion for progress, relevance for meaning, attention for worth. But the one who seeks mastery treads a lonelier road, one devoid of reassurances, where failure is not a moment of shame but an invitation to sharpen the self against the whetstone of adversity. They understand that to create is not to be seen, not to be celebrated, but to toil in the absurd knowledge that fulfillment is never guaranteed, that admiration is fleeting, and that true work, of which is a work that endures—must be carried out without the promise of reward. The artist, the thinker, the true creator does not yearn for the world's embrace, for they have made peace with the knowledge that greatness is not conferred, nor is it bestowed, merely that which, in its defiant persistence, in its refusal to be anything less than what it must be, becomes undeniable.

## Superfluity of Poetry as a form of Artistic Expression

In all high hopes for one's unique expression in artistry lies beyond all logic, and precision by simplicity in words. Poetry does exactly the opposite of this consideration, from being astray to precision, to leading emotions into something more complicated than its own unperceived conceptual circumstances, it is hardly ever certain to get to the bottom-line of a subject in terms of seeking substantial discovery of a poetic text. The validity of rejection from the despicable nature of poetry stems from the relevancy of human thought, and highlights the fragility of poetry's bitterness accustomed to being something sweet, and highly different to the prior emotion it portrays.

A polemical approach against the art of poetry:

*There isn't really much left to reconsider by a writer when writing a poem, or series of poetry. It's a simple literary form of deceiving the bold shallowness of one's own broken interpretation of their introspective, by creating mediocre allegorical analogies/phrasings to vaguely conceal the truthfulness of their own emotional implications. By reading various so-called "deep" poetry, I believe no one can genuinely become immersed by the thought behind the text (with a few classical exceptions that hold timeless literary works that have stayed influential for millennia.) It is clearly obvious how much more favoured I am towards prose writing, as not only it vividly expresses a full thought, but the art behind wasn't determined by a variety of rules, rather just a whole field of freedom.*

*Essential lifeblood of poetry is the proliferation of over-written vagueness in accordance with misleading. One may not simply consider a plain text as just being poetry, without the justification of its elements of miscalculated yielding by one's words, for the sake of a rhyme scheme which is strictly obeyed for writing this literary form. Everything is a coax for inferiority through meekness by consuming time for constructing a poem. Poetry's insignificance may be viewed in aspects of academic fields, contributing nothing to the table for improving the quality of a scholar's knowledge, and depth within legitimate artistic expressions. Although poetry shall never be invalidated by any artist, viewing the influential impacts it had throughout centuries to recollect, yet never offered useful mental discourses, nor philosophies, it stayed afloat with a sunken function. The sheer linear purpose of poetry is the conveyance of extreme emotions, that are subtly bound by words cherry picked to synchronize a sense of pattern, in formulaic structure, thus redundancy of struggle to write properly. Prevalence of misinterpretations are highlighted to conclusions left unclear for the mind to become confused of what's there to comprehend, without a guided context for ease. The sincerity of thought is delivered by the insincerity of its method. Which, to be exclusive, is a bothering flaw. The malicious absence of clarity behind the allegorical conveyance of one's poetry is infuriatingly inevitable. The reliance on metaphors, and nonlinear abstractions are highly tolerated, yet the prominence of such in ways of absolute redundancy is unlikely to be an ideal form of literature to consume for inspiration. The intention of putting severe difficulty for consumers to grasp the concept, or even the denotational aspects of a plain text of poem is nothing more than a renowned artist, but a fraud rather. The fear of expressing one's*

*personal distress, euphoria, or neutrality in a well unbent manner is merely an act of fraudulent acts. One of the key traits of such is the excessive usage of symbols, covered up with obstacles to confuse not only the readers, but the writer itself.*

*The countless need to strictly adhere to particular conventionally complicated forms may end up for poets focused merely on choosing words for their rhyme, or rhythm, rather than their meaning, or emotional impact with delivery, potentially compromising the poem's emotional authenticity for expression.*

*Factors of isolation, close-mindedness, or limited scope of one's emotional delivery, more rather the experience behind explores the poet's highly personal emotional approaches towards circumstances left unraveled by vagueness, potentially restricting the consumer's deep emotional connection astray from the poet's own introspective, defining a boundary between the bridge for one's relation to the poem. With such consideration, prevalence of exaggeration, and hyperbolic implications tend to never fade, maintaining a generic thought process structure from a variety of poems. The portrayals are exclusive for sheer evaluation of the consumer, who commonly may receive impressions of insincerity, and disingenuous. Contradictory to prose (which often implies a complete clear narrative), poetry demands higher level of literary criticisms, analyses, and interpretations from scholars, or those keenly admiring the specific field of writing, that I see as too inconsiderate for consumption of a general broader audience that can be full of cluelessness after consuming poetry. By this complicated, and complex combination of abstract words, it can be regarded to be only accessible, and enjoyable in certain niche groups of individuals who enjoy the essentiality of poetry on their literary journey. The obligation for providing further explanations, annotations, or guides for better comprehension of a poem is always absent, the obligation for concrete evidences, and bases are never required for the essence of writing poetry, making the process merely too convenient for freer expression, without concern of backing up one's assertions. Tendencies for its impact in academic contexts are highly incongruous, by irrelevance, and lack of intellectual value in accordance with the objectiveness of one's subject.*

*Poetry is in default concentrates the priority for presenting emotional expression boundlessly, rather than actually creating valuable discourses for discussion of scientific, or philosophical inquiry, and wonders. Improvements, and advancements through transcendence didn't take much useful sources from poetry writings, being the most well known as Lucretius' "On the Nature of Things" which serves as a metaphysical discourse, but was expected to be excluded for works that contributed knowledge in sciences. The intention of misleading the audiences for sheer misinterpretation of the works are highly unproven, yet also very plausible in cases the words are scrambled for ambiguity. Wherein inevitable metaphorical nature may cause such literary catastrophe, by being left available for incomprehension. With this in mind, I'm convinced by the possibilities of over-analysis to the point of providing attributed meaning for the text that may have never been intended by the poet's viewpoint, creating unjust disconnection between the analysis of the critic from the original text. The scope of nature within poetry is quite concise for complex thoughts, and philosophical perceptions being improperly oversimplified, and delivered,*

*reducing into sections of clichés from a broad consideration. The absence of such diminishes the essence of the depth, or comprehensive approach of such enlightening ideas left concealed. Most pieces of poetry I've discovered were coming off as shallow self-indulgence, merely concentrated on more clever wordplay, and stylistic approaches for flowery methods rather than emphasizing significant insights, deemed as never enjoyable for those who satisfy themselves from objectivity. It's clearly obvious to seek extremely emotional pieces, or sections in one's poem, disregarding rationality, more rather reasoning for logical outputs, undermining its effectiveness (if ever there is a degree of such) in discussing significantly important social, political, or intellectual issues, and discussions that are beneficial for the world. These inevitable, and unfathomable elements of flaws don't entirely destroy the value of poetry, yet they practically highlight the unforeseen challenges, and unraveled limitations that merely come with this literary form of artistic expression. Although the criticism towards poetry can be quite weak, it solely improves the thought behind one's personal indulgence for changing perspectives, by rating the degree of admiration for a lower score.*

The characteristics that I, and Plato have in common with our personal interrelated viewpoints is simply the disdain in poetry as shown in his "The Republic" of whom have plainly similar views to mine with regards to artistic endeavors set in his eyes of living, as to mine in a post-modern world. Where in most cases, poetry, and art itself must not be considered as a channel for truthfulness, and precision, though I beg to differ as for any form of producing human thought must express these elements, rather than generating random blabber to define rubbish coveted in praise of its "depth".

There is no particular significant reason for one to execute their expositional aspects, and concepts, to be a form of poetry of some sort, including a gist of truthfulness bombarded with linguistic gymnastics implementing complications. I consider the act of performing a structure of poetry a sign of lavishness of their own applicable time for leisure, or mental misuse. It proves the abundance of leisure time for the poet to create poetry due to the lack of consciousness of the person towards the underlying factors of their life for them to provide the necessary attention to details, and respond with eligible situational actions to alleviate, or ameliorate (in case of an issue.) The mental disuse for the disposition of a certain act of trivial judgments will result to long catastrophic circumstances to the person as it condemns the situations wherein the perception of the poet is limited to, I say this for the consideration of practical adherences in life which provides a comprehensive reason for the necessity of these so-called "practical actions". Justifying the case of this whole poetry ordeal is merely an inferior cognitive response towards the refutation against it (of which the purpose of this essay is for). As it stands without a single point of being where the justification is set clearly to be logical, and considerably reasonable, it simply states those who attempt to defend it will be left unjustified for their pure causes. Insofar, there also is not a single glorifying point to defend the concept of such rubbish Yet the general judgment, of consideration by the generality for it to be called as a unique form of art, just as a prose type of writing is not affected for the detrimental possibilities of its impacts to humanity. After such considerations however, do not greatly concern the expositional accuracy, and dedication to truthfulness of the clear evaluation of critical determination. In

historical context, there exists countless amounts of poetry which constituted various contributions to human knowledge such as "On the Nature of Things" by Lucretius, which highly romanticized Epicurean Philosophy. Yet in a form of poetry, it manages to compact a massive amount of philosophical endeavors, going further with other poetic works that state unparalleled details on certain epistemological subjects pertaining to philosophical analyses. Although with high regard, and consideration of the work to be profoundly contributing. It is obviously more difficult to dissect in a perspective of a typical mind without a particular keenness to poetry than for it to be a prose work of a philosophy exposition. It suppresses the capabilities of most to be understood, it manipulates the inaccessibility to be concretely just.

# Difficulty of Essays

There isn't any further reason to jargonize this statement, and so I attempt to be as simple as possible. To provide a certain clarity I aim to discuss to the reader whether uninterested in the existence of essays, or a passionate writer of it. In a typical life of a person, they undergo a literary stage of immersion for the satisfaction of their intellectual nourishments, or leisurely doing so. With either a strong keen interest in writing, or the disdain of even visualizing the thought of it. Essays are a common struggle for most literate individuals due to it being introduced in a form of constraint, disregarding the true essence of essay-writing, freedom. Without such, the purpose of an essay fails to be comprehensive in aspects of self-expression, and scrutiny of the idea, or subject being discussed, whether nonsensically, or sensibly. An execution of an effective essay deals with matters of intention, dedication, and comprehension of the individual writing it. Is it truly difficult to write one? In accordance with the idea of a whole point of something explanatory, criticize the crucial nature of it, for it may produce informational negligence, and intellectual bragging of one's expression. It isn't essential for essays to be factually efficient, it should only disclose an inclusion of one thing—human authenticity. What exactly do I mean for human authenticity at hand? While we're all aware of the age of gradual improvement in terms of technological aspects, it is uncommon not to see contents without the aid of any technological advances, in our case, Artificial Intelligence. Where in a simple prompt full of instructions to create a thoughtful perfection of an essay, it is very easy for that to be acquired in the hands of the capable. Essays made by nonhuman people are simply the exact opposite of my idea. I drive myself not to cause any artificial nonhuman life to begin stating ideas for feeding the lack of scrutiny of my own idea, when done hastily.

Human authenticity provides the depth of emotional angst, or joy from the bearer, and the ideas behind their implicative words shown. Regardless of the profundity artificial life can create, it must not obstruct the urge of a human to create their own flawed objection, as that epitomizes their purposes, and artificial life must be used in other aspects of aid non-related to crafting masterful literatures. The value of writing essays lies not just in its technical proficiency the human can progressively impress, but in its ability to capture the complexities, and nuances of the human experience, and the nourishment of living a bitter life itself. By comfortlessly embracing our own unique styles, we create works that aren't merely falling under the aspects of meaningful, but also humanly relatable, sparking personal connections, and conversations that transcend the boundaries of code, and calculation, and do not form a sense of indifference from everyone. No amount of intelligence judges the quality of an essay, but only the sensibility of the contents it provides in terms of words constructed, not the whole idea behind, in as most populace as possible, what significance lies within the great implications of the whole thought, without the profundity of such. The more technically obscure an essay interacts with a simple mind of a human being, degrades the power of it that is presented with intent. The power of words is not to be underestimated, nor undermined to failure, for it preserves the essence of humanity, mattering most in every significance of humanity, the essence of such, which yields the understanding of ourselves, and that is simply the purpose of existing in this world, to become certain, where natures of everything is yet to be uncovered not by our own, but rather for us to

uncover only our own. Containing the power of essence in essays is human authenticity which precedes the consideration for profundity in its purpose to convey. With how essential poetry may seem for self-expression, this goes exactly the same with prose writings, particularly essays. It does not seek the personal relationship, or definition from the perceiver of the text, where poetry seeks it, insofar making compatibility more certain to those who try to comprehend, although just as much difficulty as poetry to comprehend, it subjects the linguistic determinism, and complex understanding of it to properly be comprehended. Bare minimum intellect is solely required for reading, and writing, but empirical sensibility ameliorates further situations for accessibility in one's own essay. One's own concern in either creating, or reading one, is that it should be understandable, and not a competitive discourse made to confuse more, or represent lacking ideas. The key to creating an inevitably complicated essay is to write with expense for the matter proposed consequential to a foundational explanatory description of the necessary scrutiny. In exhaustive works like Kant's Critique of Pure Reason relies heavily on indigestible amounts of jargon, yet with pure dedication into comprehending the whole work, provides a rewarding amount of epistemological consciousness, into one's supposed ethical framework. But focusing on the whole idea, also underlies the whole mental superiorities, and state of Kant, which is the main significance of an essay, the essence of human authenticity, in terms of plenty, but one may already suffice. Outlying principles deemed by the purpose of writing an essay from unexceptional individuals may recur further constancy on seeking traction, and providing knowledge to the reader, by which integrates human authenticity, but the lack of coherence, due to the unfriendliness of the writing, which is also a factor necessary to consider as stated previously. With the simplest principles done by the writer usually impacts either one negatively, in such case, the purposive essence of the writing is flawed, of which is unprecedented for an essay's purpose, whilst imperfections are qualified. To differentiate the two, we'd only need to consider the factors left behind for integration. Factors of which are equally valuable to be disregarded, or otherwise. We can tell that coherence is a main factor, and a significant one of writing an essay, underlining the purpose of the main idea of the writing without it being understood by the masses? Or rather someone else other than the author. And thus, disintegrating this factor already removes the whole value, and essence of an essay. On the other hand, the linguistic origins of the essay written by a foreign author does not impact the whole work as significant as the lack of coherence to it, yet it still may have few complications. With this, the consideration for language does not concern much to the reader, as it can be simply translated, and will not serve difficulties as the former problem.

# Author's Concluding Note

It's an exhausting experience to have read a try-hard perplexity of one's emotive writing. And for those who incurred their own pathetic wills to discover something profound, or unconventionally fresh ideas uncovered by philosophical inquiries, you are permitted to begin stating apologies to your critical minds to beg for providing you another sense of urgency, or enthusiasm to read another kind of horrible persistence in one's writing, putting it simply as reading another book. I assure another set of expected presumptions towards another kind of fields related to some of the sections of this book as pertained to those sections as a prelude to something larger, and broader in sense, thus I obliged to provide further discussions thereof. With all numerous inconclusive claims made by further complications of sensible inquiries, I present to give you another final advice in finishing this book:

Please, let this work be the reason for your thought that people who pursue to define, and polish the endeavors of what they may consider as "philosophy" are those who are highly idiotic enough to think it's a wise-man's profundity of commitment to consider, but truth is that, it brings them their own definitions of personal judgments in life, with the aim for something greater, influencing other people to have this same manner of thinking (in circumstances those have taken actual seriousness to the works), thus giving all the perfect sense of meaning in life, to waste it on their own terms as to how the initial bearers desire to have come by themselves.

—Coronado, F.L.

# References & Sources

Darwin, C. (1859). "On the Origin of Species”

Dostoevsky, F. (1866). "Crime and Punishment"

Einstein, A. (1916). "Relativity: The Special and General Theory”

Epicurus. (c. 3rd century BCE). "Letter to Menoeceus”

Hegel, G. W. F. (1807). "Phenomenology of Spirit"

Holy Bible.

Kant, I. (1781/1787). "Critique of Pure Reason

Kant, I. (1785). "Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals"

Lucretius. (c. 50 BCE). "On the Nature of Things"

Newton, I. (1687). "Philosophiæ Naturalis Principia Mathematica".

Plato. (c. 375 BCE). "The Republic"